

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLVI

NOVEMBER, 1948

NO. 1031

Truth and International Understanding

HIS HOLINESS, POPE PIUS XII

*An address given at Castel Gandolfo to delegates to the 37th Conference
of the International Parliamentary Union, September 10, 1948*

RECEIVE, gentlemen, the expression of Our benevolent gratitude for the sentiments of high deference that have inspired you on the occasion of your thirty-seventh meeting in assembling about the head of the Catholic Church, to which all nations are profoundly dear and which has no greater desire at heart than to see them, in cordial union, sincerely and efficaciously laboring each one for the good of all.

May it be permitted to Us to proclaim before you Our intimate conviction of a particular solicitude on the part of Divine Providence for your interparliamentary institution. Your institution, which has striven to make and maintain contact and friendly collaboration among the official representatives of the most diverse nations, has, moreover, in a remarkable manner, survived the terrible trial of two world wars and innumerable changes in political regimes; and far from permitting itself to become discouraged has taken up as soon as possible after each of these crises (that might have been fatal) its salutary activity.

Furthermore, one would be tempted to say that each of these national and international crises has only served to emphasize the opportunity awaiting your institution and to stimulate further your own zeal.

Have no doubt: your laudable and victorious perseverance cannot fail to attain, one day or another—and We wish it to be soon—the high

ideal you envisage and toward which you strive with energy, despite the obstacles and the difficulties. The object of your meetings is always most imposing in its interest for the prosperity of peoples, and indicates clearly your concern to work in every way within your power—and beyond territorial and partisan frontiers—for the realization of the good to which, according to your program, you are consecrating all your efforts.

Permit Us to express, on the subject of this program and the labors of your conference, two considerations so closely bound up with one another that they mutually condition and follow one from the other. Your institution rests on the fact of the identity, under all latitudes and in all climes, of the nature of man. Everywhere the innate sense of law is found to be invariable and indestructible in itself, but susceptible of being altered by passions.

It is for you to labor together to maintain it intact and to make it mature and blossom into full flower, despite all exigencies of regional or national egoism; We have said of egoism and not of incontestable rights, of real necessities. These latter, on the contrary, are just and the impartial sense of law must expressly recognize them. To reconcile particular interests, presuming them all to be legitimate, is a very difficult but not an insurmountable task. One can always end up by finding a way to an accord between parties by some supportable and even acceptable compromise.

Would there not then be another solution than that of war, or the constraint of brute force, for these particular necessities?

Therefore, We have been pleased to know that in your ranks are representatives of all nations. From the contact of your ideas there will come forth more spontaneously and more wildly a diffusion of sparks, not those of the conflagration that starts and extends conflict, but those sweetly luminous sparks that cause to shine everywhere the brightness of light in the respect of the rights of others.

PROPAGANDA AND TRUTH

May then your institution, in special manner as it has already done, exercise its beneficent influence on the power (so often harmful) of propaganda, to make it serve on every occasion that truth which is one and inviolable. That would mark a great progression on the road to peace.

We know well, alas, the obstacles that stand in the way of this idea of veracity. But one must always hold that men can and ought to extend every effort, step by step, to attain this ideal. In any case, the cessation of narrow-minded propaganda, which, with no care for truth, lowers itself to the role of a servant blindly docile to the egoism of parties or of nations, will, indeed, be necessary.

From this double viewpoint your institute is in a position to offer an outstandingly precious contribution to the cause of peace, thanks to the common pooling of international possibilities which are, among you, united with the uprightness of juridical thought. Among you, they also are united to the good will deriving from mutual understanding that is loyal and well intentioned, deriving from the friendly study of controversies with the intention of discovering those points of accord that will permit the ending of differences, deriving, finally, from the establishment of mutual relations which, even where there is opposition of ideas, will nevertheless establish a sympathetic atmosphere between adversaries. This sympathy, perhaps more personal than objective in character, nevertheless greatly facilitates serenity in the exchange of views and discussions by creating what is called "a favorable pre-judgment," at least in regard to all that concerns sincerity, uprightness of intention and good will.

In conclusion, note how it would have been impossible for Us not to have had at heart the success and fruitfulness of meetings such as yours, and for this reason, with all the fervor of Our prayer, We call down upon you gentlemen, in your labors and the persons of your respective fatherlands, the abundance of Divine light and benedictions.

Pray for Peace

Excerpts from an address of the Holy Father to 550 American pilgrims whom he received in audience at the papal summer residence at Castel Gandolfo, September 2, 1948.

HEARING of this large pilgrimage come from across the seas to visit the shrines of Europe on their journey to this center of Christendom, one might be tempted to conclude that, at long last, a genuine and stable peace with its normal consequences had been restored to the world. That is not true. The tragic fact is that millions

of human beings who were caught up in the maelstrom of a war which was declared finished more than three years ago are still in this very Europe living in conditions that are inhuman; and war still rages in more than another section of the world, while other millions must suffer under an unwanted tyranny.

To describe these conditions, which weigh so heavily on Our paternal heart, is beside our purpose here. But shortly, as you know, the Assembly of the United Nations will resume its sessions duly authorized to grapple with problems of world peace and security.

Men of learning and experience, of high character and lofty ideals, fully conscious of their momentous responsibility to civilization and culture, will put forth their best effort to reensure the family of nations, and, as We fondly hope, not only save it from an unimaginable cataclysm but put it on the road that leads to joy in justice to all, working men and employers alike, to morality in national and individual life that has its only possible basis in religious faith in God.

If ever an assembly of men, gathered at a critical crossroad in history, needed the help of prayer, it is the Assembly of the United Nations.

APPEALS FOR PRAYERS

Hence We ask you, venerable brothers, you, Our cherished sons in the sacred priesthood and you, Our beloved children in Christ Jesus, to pray. Let Our voice carry beyond you to all your fellow Catholics in America; yes, to all Catholics in every country on the face of the earth. And We like to hope that you will be joined by all men of good will.

During the coming days, let there rise to the throne of God, the Father of Mercy, a pentecostal paean of praise and adoration. "We extol thee, O God, and we bless Thy name forever. Thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages, and Thy dominion endureth throughout all generations" (Ps. 144, 1, 13).

"All things are in Thy power and there is none that can resist Thy will" (Esther 13, 9). Thou art, O God, of all things the author and maker, their exemplar, their measure and their end."

And then, following this act of faith, with humble and contrite heart, let men make their own the prayer of Daniel: "We have sinned. We have committed iniquity, we have done wickedly and have revolted: and we have gone aside from Thy Commandments and Thy judgments. . . . The Lord our God is just in all His works which He has done: for we have not hearkened to His voice" (Dan. 9, 5, 14).

Then haply God, infinitely wise and infinitely good, moved by the chastened faith and repentance of His creatures, will incline His ear, will look upon their desolation and come to their assistance.

Surely, He has proved His love for men when He sent His only begotten Son into the world, so that they might have life through Him (1 John 4, 9).

We conclude, beloved children, with the repeated expression of Our immense gratitude for the charity you have shown to the war-stricken countries of the world, and for the magnificent generosity with which your devoted hierarchy enables Christ's Vicar to answer the heart-rending appeals that come and still come incessantly to his desk from the families, towns and whole provinces that must struggle with decreasing strength, and often waning hope, to eke out their existence until better days dawn.

God will reward you, each and every one of those whose smallest contributions made the total possible. Receive as a token of Our sincere thanks the Apostolic Benediction, which with all the affection of a father's heart We impart to you, to all your dear ones at home, to all those whom you wish now to have remembered.



For Bankers

"The influence of banks is enormous. They are channels of credit. They provide capital for commerce, agriculture and industry. They have as a result great social influence. The economic system as it functions today cannot exist without bank credit. Banks control the flow of money. It is, therefore, essential that they avoid harmful practices which violate equity, and endanger the well-being of the people; that they promote a sound economy and a healthy social order. This demands on the part of the directors and employes of banks a knowledge of economic problems, a social sense, an exact conscience and good faith."—*Pope Pius XII to a delegation of officials and employes of the Bank of Naples, June 22, 1948.*

White Collar Worker and Wall Street

JOSEPH FITZPATRICK, S.J.

A paper read at the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, January 30, 1948

*Reprinted from The AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW**

DURING the last summer I often had occasion to recall some of my boyhood reading about frontier days when stories would be told of the one man in the town who knew how to read and write. He was a necessary part of every important event. Men and boys would gather around him to watch him trace the marvelous little figures on a page. When his writing was done, he would close his book carefully, set it aside in a well guarded place lest it be injured or lost. This was no common thing like the plows or harness in the barn, or even like the firearms hanging on the wall. This skill was above the power of ordinary men, and our hero was reverenced for possessing it.

Add to this tale a little experience of my own. During the summer and fall when I was making a study of Wall Street, workers were building the approaches to the Battery Tunnel not far away. At noon time, thousands of men would come down from the offices in the vicinity and spend most of their lunch period watching with interest and awe as the riveters, the steelworkers, the cranes and bulldozers went about their work. I

often reflected that men never gather to watch a group of office clerks at work. I noted something else, too: I don't remember ever seeing a woman among the spectators.

Perhaps in these two little incidents, you can see the outlines of the problem of white-collar workers today.

In the great concern of sociologists about the impact of our industrial system on the life of workers, they generally confine themselves to the workers in factories. They do not pay similar attention to the industrial revolution in the office where efficiency and technology are causing changes which may have as great an influence on our institutions as the changes in the factory.

It is quite significant that widespread interest was shown in the white-collar workers only when they began to feel the pinch of inflation on a salaried income. This presumed that the only problem of white-collar people was a problem of wages and prices, as if there were nothing in the changing nature of white-collar work and its effect on social life that need concern us. These people were taken

* Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 11, Ill.

not granted as being "safe." They were in the sheltered security of the office, where it was understood that one enjoyed the benefits of the American way of life and appreciated them. Here at least our system of enterprise was normal; people did not have to worry about the upsets and disturbances that unions caused in other areas.

A little reflection may indicate that all is not as normal as we had believed. In the present paper, therefore, I would like, first, to give a rather elementary outline of the changing nature and function of white-collar work, and our attitudes toward it; second, to point out a few concrete examples of these changes in the lives of Wall Street clerks; third, to offer a few points for discussion about the place of white-collar work in the future.

TRADITIONAL ATTITUDE TOWARD WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

The Bureau of the Census lists a large number of people in the category of white-collar workers. I wish to confine myself to the much more limited area of clerical workers in offices. The workers I have in mind will be found in banks, insurance companies, government offices and the offices of large corporations, in law offices, brokerage houses, real estate offices, publishing houses and the like. It is the nature of the change in this area that I wish to examine.

Traditionally in America, a great deal more prestige has been associated with white-collar jobs than with manual labor, or even skilled jobs in shop and factory. The struggle of immigrant peoples to establish themselves had something to do with this: generally their first step into respected circles occurred when they got an "office job." But this was not by any means the whole story. The white-collar worker was considered to be doing a more important job than the men in the factories; he required a better academic education and more refinement and, in many ways, he was considered to be on a higher social level. He had inherited the respect paid to the frontiersman in the story who could read and write; we paid him this respect willingly. He had taken the step from a hard job that required physical labor to a respectable one that was supposed to require brains.

This prestige did seem to have a genuine basis in the responsible work that an office clerk did. He did not have just a job; he had a position, something implying a share in the control and direction of an enterprise. He was expected to give himself with full devotion to his duty; the center of attention was never the number of pieces produced nor the number of hours worked, but the demands of the job itself. The work, not the reward, was uppermost in his mind, because his work was import-

ant enough to warrant real devotion. He stayed until the brief was completed, until the books were balanced, until all the trades had been cleared, until the copy was ready for the press—and he did this not with overtime in mind, but because that was his job, and his job was important. He was regarded as one received into the business, and he was expected to be grateful for the opportunity to advance in a business in which he could prosper. In an unusual number of cases, prosper he did.

PRESENT CHARACTERISTICS OF WHITE-COLLAR WORK

It is clear that this traditional type of white-collar work has changed considerably. Technology and the division of labor have broken office jobs down into a series of semi-skilled, unskilled and routinized tasks. The good general office clerk is still a prize possession, but it is no longer true that the general run of office workers require more education than the worker in shop or factory. Indeed, the skilled workers require a training and apprenticeship that make an office job look simple. Everyone has academic training now; everyone can read and write and take an office job; many of the Wall Street girls came out of shops and factories. But not everyone can weld a steel seam or run a turret lathe. In these days of technology, prestige is no longer accorded so much to the man who presumes to

work with his brain in an office, but to the man on the line who has the "know how" or who can "get things done" in a technical system. The office worker now has little knowledge of the business, his limited task never giving him a glimpse of the whole operation. In general, he is as far removed from the important men in management as the production workers, and he has no more share in activities of control or direction than the men on the assembly line. He is tied to typewriters, IBM's and record files as ruthlessly as a factory worker can be tied to a machine.

With this change in the nature of their work, a change has also been taking place in the minds of the white-collar workers. They realize more clearly every day that their work is not as important as it once was; that they play nothing like the vital part that production workers play in our economic and social life. Let the office force of a big Power and Light Co. threaten to go on strike; I doubt if anyone would be too excited about it. But let the men in the power plants make the same threat and everyone from the mayor to the humblest housewife is worried about it. This cannot be reduced to a mere matter of large and powerful labor unions; it is a matter of one type of work being more vital and valuable than the other. And the white-collar workers know it.

The most important result of all

these changes is the steady influx of women into white-collar jobs. This is not an accident. Office managers realize that the jobs hold relatively little chance for advancement, and are not valuable enough for more than a moderate salary. Therefore, apart from the fact that women are more efficient in routine office work, the employer knows that, with women in these jobs who are only filling in the time between high school and marriage, or who are supplementing a husband's salary, he has little or no worry about the possible ill effects of a moderate salary, or the disappointment that attends the lack of advancement for a man in the same job. One of the officials of the New York Employment Service told me recently: "I have a dozen jobs, and good ones, for every woman who applies; but I haven't one job for every dozen men that need one." This defines the white-collar problem, therefore, as a man's problem at the present time. It may become a woman's problem later.

SOME CONCRETE EXAMPLES FROM WORKERS ON WALL STREET¹

Perhaps this is the meaning of the story of the tunnel workers. No women were watching them; women are not concerned about technology. But I wonder if the interest of the men in that construction was not made stronger by the sense that "building

things" has so little part in their own lives.

When I use the term Wall Street, I mean to restrict it to the brokerage houses and the Stock Exchanges through which they operate. In relation to our discussion, Wall Street is not a typical white-collar area. By that I mean two things:

1. With the exception of one firm, which I shall mention later, the brokerage offices never went through the revolution which I described in the first part of this paper. With the exception of the introduction of IBM's into some of the larger offices, the brokerage houses plod along in their same old-fashioned way. There is not much standardization, not much more division of labor than appeared in the twenties or before, not much zeal for efficiency. Just as long as the job gets done, sufficient for the day is the trading thereof. Furthermore, Wall Street was a man's world and was kept so deliberately until 1942. Women came with the shortage of men during the war. Therefore, with one exception, the Wall Street office has not gone modern.

2. The second important factor is the lack of opportunity in the brokerage houses, which has been serious for the past seventeen years. But this has not been the result of a revolution in office management. It has been due to the contracting nature of the busi-

¹ The following remarks are a few excerpts from an extensive study, now in preparation, on employer-employee relations on Wall Street. The present remarks are not by any means an adequate treatment of the situation.

ness as a whole. The number of employes in brokerage and investment has declined 60 per cent since 1929. It had gone as far as 70 per cent lower in 1943. When one compares this with other white-collar areas, he sees immediately what this means. Banks employ the same number as they did in 1929; insurance companies employ 40 per cent more in home offices than they did in 1929; real estate offices employ 47 per cent more; and law offices employ 49 per cent more; brokerage and investment—60 per cent less. On the basis of simple proportion, it is clear that the field has narrowed drastically.

Although these two characteristics of the brokerage industry are not found elsewhere, the attitude of the Wall Street worker has been changing in a way that is important for our problem. He does not have very high regard for the importance of his job to the nation. He may have a responsible job in the sense that his mistake may cost a firm large sums of money. But when the Wall Street clerks were classified by selective service in the same category as the makers of artificial flowers, not even the most idealistic of them felt very important. But what had an equally depressing effect on them was the introduction of women into their jobs. In the man's world that it was, there was a general spirit that this was a man's work; at least there was something rugged and superior about it. But when

women came in and were often able to carry on as effectively as the older and experienced men, it was another shock to the sense of their own importance.

Furthermore, the men have a very pessimistic outlook on their future possibilities on the Street. The pages on the Exchange will tell you that, as soon as they begin to work on that job, the older employes come to them and warn them not to stay in the business: "We're here 25, 28 or 30 years and where have we gotten? No! Better get into something that has more of a future."

WOMEN IN WALL STREET

Strangely enough, among those who recognize the closing in of opportunity on the clerks are the women who have taken so many of their jobs. When asked what they think of a Wall Street job, the girls almost unanimously reply: "It's all right for us, but I would not want to see a man in my place; I can't see how he could get anywhere." Nor are the brokers silent members of the constant chorus: "There's not much future here." Many of them have conducted trainee courses to attract college men to higher positions in the work. With one exception, they have had little success. The young men are not responding. Wall Street is not too keen about the value of its jobs. Granted that part of this situation has been caused by contracting business, a fac-

or which other white-collar areas do not face, it is important to note that the typical attitude of the white-collar worker is there. If women do not already have their jobs, women could well take them and handle them with less expense to the office and more contentment to themselves.

There is one firm where the transition to the modern office has taken place, the firm of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Beane. In creating an efficient and centralized home office to clear the business of its ninety-seven branches, this firm broke many of its jobs down into small, standardized units; in many cases people can be trained for them in a short time. More than half the "back office" employes are young women; and if one eliminated the men in supervisory positions, the proportion of women would be even greater. For the most part they are young, know little about the business as a whole, and have little intention of remaining for a career. The office is neat, efficiently run and, apart from the informality that marks every brokerage house, gives more the appearance of an insurance company than a brokerage house. If this presents the pattern for the future, it is the pattern of the office revolution: "Only a man can get anywhere here," say the women, "but I would not want to see a man in my place."

This situation prompts a remark about union activity. On Wall Street

it is significant that the two Stock Exchanges are solidly organized; whereas attempts to organize brokerage houses have met with little success. There are many factors responsible for this. I want to single only one out for some attention here. On the Exchanges there are four types of jobs on the trading floor; in each type you have a standardized, routine sort of work in which a large number of men are doing exactly the same thing all the time. With the exception of the pages, these men have been doing the job for twenty or more years and may be doing it for the rest of their lives. However correct their judgment is, they are convinced that advance to a broker's position is a dream that only one in a thousand ever sees come true; it cannot be used as a basis for practical action. The actual job they do is relatively unskilled (I stress the actual job they do; most of these clerks have as competent a knowledge of securities trading as many of the brokers on the floor, and would be competent brokers tomorrow if they had the chance.) Until the union won substantial increases, the salaries of these employes were surprisingly small. I think you see the pattern very clearly: Men who require a substantial salary—in a relatively unskilled job—doing standardized, routine work—where hope of advancement has all but faded—all these provided a perfect situation for a union.

However, in the brokerage houses the situation was quite different. From the salary standpoint, the men in the brokerage houses were not doing much better than the men on the Exchanges; and, in most of their minds, the chance for advancement was no more promising. But the jobs in a brokerage house are so varied that it is almost impossible to find two men doing the same thing. There is enough difference to give men a sense of individuality; to keep alive the conviction—whether right or wrong—that they will be able to attract recognition and possibly advancement on the strength of their own merits. This by no means gives a complete explanation of union activity in Wall Street—it is only one factor, but I stressed it because it was relevant to the point we were discussing. Probably the strongest contrast along these lines is the fact that in the Stock Exchange itself, where four separate departments are well organized, the one group that has not joined are the people in the administrative offices of the Exchange itself, the people who most resemble office clerks. When the office workers here or anywhere become standardized and follow a routine, things may be different.

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

With this as a background I would like to suggest a few simple points for discussion:

1. Within the structure of American industry and business, office work seems to be an elaborate way of keeping records. The more complex an operation becomes, the more difficult it is to keep track of it, and the function of the modern office is to keep, in an orderly and available way, important information and provide it for executives and customers when they require it. Therefore, as our economy becomes more extensive and complex, office routine will not diminish but increase, and with it will increase the number of routine jobs, making more widespread the white-collar situation we have been speaking about. The office will present problems similar to those of the factory.

Is it fortunate, in a sense, that, as this change developed, women became more and more available for this type of work? At present women almost monopolize these jobs. Thus, in moderately paying jobs where advancement is not a serious issue, we have a group of people more perfectly suited to the work than men. Is it possible that this is protecting us, for the time being, from the problem of a white-collar proletariat, i.e., large numbers of men who would have people dependent on them while they themselves would be completely dependent on what today would be called a woman's work?

2. Let me suggest another point. Why should people cling to a sense of individual achievement in a situa-

tion where the work is standardized and routine? They do cling to it. So many of them have told me in one breath: "I can't see how I can get any farther than I am," and in the next breath add: "I don't see why I should stay on a level with others, I want to get ahead on the merits of my own work." I have often wondered whether this is a good thing. If they are, in a loose sense of the term, stratified in their occupation, would not a sense of the solidarity of their own group be more helpful, with an awareness of their interests as a group. I do not mean a class consciousness, but a clearer realization of their function in our economic and social life, and of the contribution they should be making in their own limited position to the more harmonious working of the whole system. Generally when things become difficult for the white-collar worker, either he endures in patience or gets out of the field. Meanwhile the pattern for the future is being moulded by big management and big labor. In a sense there should be a way for the white-collar worker to be big, too. This does not necessarily mean union activity. There are "Twenty-Five Year Clubs" scattered through thousands of offices in the country, but apart from writing letters against union organizing, I am not aware that, alone or together, they have ever voiced their opinion, as office workers, on anything. On Wall Street,

there are street-wide associations of department heads. During the war, when the War Labor Board all but killed the Wall Street bonuses, these modest associations made themselves heard by government officials in an effort to correct the inequity. Strangely enough when the real squeeze of high wages and higher prices is on the office workers, they have no way of expressing an intelligent and independent voice, as office workers, about their own interests.

FALSE PRESTIGE

Part of this, among younger workers, may be due to management's general policy of hiring only people who will be "suitable to us," in the sense of people who fit into the office routine and cause no trouble. As one person familiar with a large New York insurance office remarked: "If anybody showed any initiative or originality in that office, it would throw the system out of gear and cause confusion." This suggests a serious consideration: Is the routine of the office, the constant fitting into a pattern, making workers resistant to all change; have they lost the imagination and originality needed to make provisions against the difficulties of the future?

3. Is it possible that we are associating a false prestige with white-collar work? As I have pointed out, most of the basis for the former

prestige of white-collar work has gone. Now an office worker in many jobs has little more to boast about than pleasant surroundings and nice people to work with. If prestige is supposed to be based on achievement and importance, or in the positive contribution that a job makes to our society or a person's life, may we not be building up a false ideal in the minds of our young people by allowing them to think that white-collar work represents an area of real achievement in American life?

This has even more point from the practical standpoint of Catholic education. We are educating a large group of boys (and it's the boys, not the girls I am concerned about) who will find themselves in white-collar jobs. If a boy follows our advice and makes an effort to get a Catholic high school education, he must perform follow commercial or academic courses. There are no others. If these boys do not continue on to college or professional training, they will find themselves ill equipped for anything but a routine office job. It may be

well to ask ourselves whether we are preparing these boys with the right attitudes, if we are preparing them with any attitudes at all, to face their office work and make the most of it.

4. Perhaps there may be some light on this from a different angle. Maybe we should inquire more carefully just what satisfaction a man expects from his job. I was quite impressed by the great concern among Wall Street men, not for their job, but for their home. As long as they could keep a good home, raise their children properly, have a respectable standing in their communities, many of them didn't seem too concerned about the monotony of their work or its lack of meaning. They associated prestige primarily with their home, not with their job. We are inclined to criticize the fact that our American society rates a man's importance too much by what he does. Perhaps on lower levels of employment, men are more inclined than we think to attach prestige to the way a man rates at home rather than in the office.



Christian System

"The politicians and economists of the classical school have had their day, and the twentieth century will be for the people and for laws of common prosperity under a Christian system."—*Cardinal Manning in a letter to The TIMES, London, January 8, 1891.*

Catholics and Canadian Politics

HENRY SOMERVILLE

Editor, The CANADIAN REGISTER

*Reprinted from the CANADIAN REGISTER**

THE provincial and federal victories of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in recent elections have caused perturbations in political circles. Coalitions of other parties against the C.C.F. are already the rule in the Western provinces and there are those who advocate such an alignment of parties in the federal field. There is no reason why a Catholic newspaper should comment on the purely political or party interests concerned. The party managers are doubtless competent to judge where their advantages lie.

The Catholic Church leaves her members generally free to decide for themselves how they shall vote. A Catholic must regard religious interests as being of the highest importance, but he must use his own judgment as to how those interests are safeguarded in the political field. One party, the Communist Party, which calls itself Labor-Progressive in Canada, is condemned by the Church because it is committed to an atheistic philosophy and because it is part of an international organization which has always used its power against the Church.

Catholic opposition to communism

cannot be too firm but it can be ill-directed. The Nazis in Germany and the Fascists in Italy exploited Catholic anti-communism in ways that were as damaging as they were unscrupulous. Here in Canada there are Catholics who fear the C.C.F. as leading to communism. They point out that the Communists, in ridings where there was no communist candidate, called for support of the C.C.F.; that the views of some individual C.C.F.'ers are so extreme as to verge on communism, and that the C.C.F., as a party of the Left, is nearest to the Communist Party, which is on the extreme Left.

Other Catholics take different views. To the first of the foregoing arguments they reply that the communist support of the C.C.F. is purely tactical, as was Communist support of the Liberal Party in the last federal general election. To the second argument they reply that every party has its individual extremists and bigots of various kinds. The third argument they dismiss as due to an irrational reaction from one extreme to the other, as if moving as far away as possible from what communism

* Kingston, Ontario, Canada. June 19, 1948

stands for was the best method of resisting its advance.

We ourselves do not decide between these arguments. We hold no brief for or against the C.C.F. But we must affirm with all emphasis that it is false, unjust and dangerous so say that the C.C.F. is communist or to confound the C.C.F. with communism. The C.C.F. has fought the Communist Party with all its strength both in the political field and in the labor unions, in the great industrial plants during the daytime and at lodge meetings in the evenings and week-ends. The C.C.F. and the labor unions have been the barrier to communist capture of the working masses in English-speaking Canada.

WHITE-WASHING COMMUNISM

If the working masses could be persuaded that the C.C.F. and communism were pretty much the same, the conclusion they would draw would not be that the C.C.F. is to be denounced but that communism is not so bad. Smearing the C.C.F. only tends to whitewash communism. If Pat Conroy is bracketed with Tim Buck, it will not discredit Pat Conroy in the eyes of the labor men but it will lend respectability to the communist leader.

Though we speak emphatically about this political confusion which plays into communist hands, we are much less concerned about political consequences than about wanton and unnecessary trials to the religious faith and loyalty of Catholic working people. Rightly or wrongly there are hundreds of thousands who regard the C.C.F. as the party of labor against the parties of capital, of the poor against the rich. To tell Catholics who share these political views that their thinking is against the mind of the Church is to impose on them a terrible and unwarranted trial of conscience.

The danger here indicated is not fanciful or far-fetched. Pope Pius XI, with the countries of Continental Europe before his eyes, said that the great scandal of the century was that the Church had lost the working classes. Is there anyone who does not know the countries where the workers, Catholic by baptism, have been persuaded that the Church sides with the wealthy classes? Let no Catholic in Canada allow his antagonism to new political forces do anything to create that tragic estrangement between the Church and Labor which is the scandal of religion in too many other places.

What Is Justice?

CLARENCE E. MANION

AMERICANS are devoted to a wide variety of ball games. In every season of the year millions of us are continually congregating to observe the swift, skillfully-directed flight of base balls, footballs, basket balls and golf balls. In all of these contests and exhibitions the existence, nature and condition of the ball involved has become a remote, secondary consideration. The ball is taken for granted. We are concerned exclusively with the skill and co-ordination of the players and their intelligent observance of the rules. Nevertheless, in all of these games it must be admitted that "the ball" is the thing that registers on the score board.

I realize that the American Judicature Society is not a playful organization, and that any attempt to make a game out of its most serious pursuits risks a rupture of the very point that I am trying to make. Nevertheless, I submit that our concern with the efficient administration of justice is not unlike the enthusiastic interest of a typical baseball fan in the hitting, running and fielding of his favorite team.

What is this thing called justice that is being tossed and thrown around the ever-green field of the law? What

This address by the Dean of the College of Law, University of Notre Dame, was delivered at a Convention of the American Judicature Society of the American Bar Association, at Seattle, Washington, September 8, 1948.

are its standard ingredients, and its distinguishing marks and characteristics? The skilled baseball pitcher knows the size, weight and consistency of the ball he throws to the batter and the slightest change in those constituents would be telegraphed immediately through practiced fingers to the pitcher's brain. There is a continuing and uniform standard for baseballs; consequently, coaches and players may concentrate upon the development of manual and muscular skill along with a study of operational rules.

But upon the broad playing fields of Justice there is no longer any such uniform standard. Our judicature society is consequently concerned with the efficient dispensation and administration of an uncertainty. In a constantly growing number of important instances, Justice has assumed the unfortunate quality of "this to me and that to thee."

It is an increasingly difficult business to promote the efficient administration of something that has lost a commonly accepted definition. In such a promotion mere perfection of form does not compensate for the loss of essential substance. While justice may no longer be definable in the vocabulary of the average lawyer, the rampant injustices of our present civilization are unmistakeable everywhere and known to practically everybody. This is not surprising and it involves no contradiction. Just as a lie can travel seven leagues while truth is getting on its boots, so also can disease, disorder and injustice make themselves quickly evident to those to whom the real nature of health, peace and justice is wholly incomprehensible.

LAW AND MORALS

We can undoubtedly improve the situation of justice in our American legal system by correcting obvious and notorious abuses in its administration, but the genuine and sustained health of our American jurisprudence calls for a sharp *accentuation of the positive*. We must shift our concern from the improvement of its methods to a propagation of the principles that underlie American law. A first approach to such a program can be achieved by emphasizing the inextricable association of law and morals in the United States. Our jurisprudence is deeply rooted in religion. Its

current miscarriages both in principles and practice are traceable in every instance to a perverted modern determination to regard our legal system as a strictly secular instrument for the achievement of purely temporal ends.

This explosive de-naturing of our essentially religious legal system has frustrated the traditional logic of its ancient processes and subjected American law to the ridicule of both "liberals" and "conservatives." The statement that we cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear is true likewise in its converse. American law was designed to implement the Ten Commandments by underscoring the responsibility of the individual human conscience. Such an implement cannot be tortured into an effective tool for the accomplishment of materialistic totalitarian purposes. It is true that many American lawyers have honestly missed or glossed over the religious implications of our legal and constitutional system, but the resulting mistaken impression is easily corrected.

At every point in our civil and criminal jurisprudence one finds unmistakeable evidence that religious faith and religious practices, universally acknowledged for hundreds of years prior to the American Revolution, constitute the base and foundation of our American legal system. Let us take such a commonplace example as the requirement of intention

as a prerequisite for guilt in criminal cases. If one person kills another, why is the intention of the killer all-important in the determination of his guilt? As far as the injury to society is concerned, the victim is just as dead and the social loss just as great in an unintentional homicide as it is in the case of a deliberate and premeditated murder.

In his famous *Commentaries*, published (1765) on the eve of the American Revolution, Blackstone explains it this way:

Punishments are inflicted for the abuse of that free will which God has given to man, consequently it is just that man should be excused from those acts done involuntarily or through unavoidable force or compulsion . . . An involuntary act has no claim to merit, neither can it induce any guilt.

Thus, crime is punishable in and under our law only when the necessary elements of a sin are present in the committer. Now "sin" is a moral concept and consequently it is patent that our criminal courts are "Morals Courts" in the strictly religious connotation of the term "Morals." The "corpus delicti" requires evidence that the injury was inflicted by a "human being." Why? Because only human beings have moral and therefore legal responsibility in and under our system. In searching out the crime the court must find the guilty personal conscience. Unless a guilty conscience is involved, there is no criminal jurisdiction.

The same is true of the civil side of our legal system. Our courts entertain suits between persons only. No American lawyer has ever litigated a suit for or against such impersonal non-entities as "labor," "capital," "management," "the under-privileged," "the economic Royalists" or "Wall Street." These impersonal non-entities are frequently indicted in the newspapers but never by a State or Federal grand jury.

When the injury complained of in these impersonal, blanket, popular and political indictments comes on to be redressed in the courts—if it ever does—the first requisite is to break through the barrier of this confusing class consciousness and find your man. In other words the court must find the guilty personal conscience. The culprit, if there is one, may be a broker, a banker, a laborer, lawyer or a politician, but if there is any criminal guilt it is and must be shown to be personal.

It is a necessary part of the American system that persons are rewarded and punished for what they do rather than for what they are. It is more than a coincidence that the rewards of Heaven and the pains of Hell are passed out on the same basis of personal performance. The mere fact that one is an aristocrat or a proletarian gives him no passport through the Pearly Gates; neither does such a status keep him out. In the moral order, reward like punishment is a

personal achievement. The same formula is in the warp and woof of our legal system.

Socialism, Communism and Fascism are all based upon the theory of collective responsibility and as such are all directly opposed to the basic American principle of personal, individual responsibility. This collectivistic concept of law and justice is a European institution stemming out of the French Revolution. That revolution generated a centrifugal force which was essentially disintegrating. It tore apart the natural heart, hub and center of European society, namely, the personality of the individual human being, and threw the fragments out to the rim of the wheel where they congealed in the form of "classes," "races" and "groups."

THE CURSE OF COLLECTIVISM

Thereafter, in European jurisprudence, man lost his precious God-given individuality and became simply a part of the class or group of society into which he was hopelessly frozen. Thereafter, throughout the bloody European regimes of Danton, Robespierre, Napoleon, Hitler and Stalin, the European "citizen" was no longer a "man": he was an "aristocrat," a "proletarian," a "kulak" or a member of the "Master Race." This artificial man-made curse of collectivism has plagued the politics and economics of Europe from the French Revolution to the present day. Un-

der this materialistic curse, Europe has marched through an endless procession of wars, pestilence and persecution.

While the French Revolution was brewing, the American Revolution was evolving in the opposite direction, generating and integrating a centripetal force which anchored the whole purpose of our law and government in the natural hub and center of society, the personal soul of the individual man. To preserve these God-given rights of this individual God-made man, said the American Declaration of Independence, "Governments are instituted among men."

Thus our system of personal rights, personal duties and personal man-to-man justice was put into direct competition with the socialized, class-conscious collectivism of Europe. What has been the result? Forty million people rushed from Europe to America between Washington's first inauguration to 1921, when Congress closed the gates to this tide of immigration.

What the *Encyclopedia Britannica* calls "the greatest mass movement of population in history" followed in the mad scramble of men and women to get away from the collectivistic European system and into and under the American system of personalized justice. Uncounted millions all around the world now prize, next to life itself, the hoped-for opportunity to come to the U.S.A., where constitu-

tions and laws are made to protect the God-given rights of the individual God-made man.

The very front pages of United States' history are replete with evidence of the fact that the leaders of the American Revolution perceived—not taxes or tea-parties merely—but the real juridical issue that they faced in the impending struggle. Pleading the "rights of the British Colonies," James Otis sparked the Revolutionary struggle in these words:

To those who lay the foundation of government in force and more brutal power, it is objected that their system destroys all distinction between right and wrong; that it overturns all morality, leads directly to Scepticism and ends in Atheism. When a man's will and pleasure is his only rule and guide, what safety can there be either for him or against him but in the point of a sword? That the common good of the people is the supreme law, is of the law of nature and part of that grand charter given to the human race (though too many of them are afraid to assert it) by the only Monarch in the Universe who alone has a clear and indisputable right to absolute power because he is the only one who is omniscient as well as omnipotent.

Otis and his generation saw clearly that the only protection against the fallibility of omnipotent government lies in the infallibility of an Omnipotent God. For this logical reason liberty and morality were inseparably linked together throughout every line and letter of the new American legal system.

When George Mason, author of the Virginia Bill of Rights, which was the model for all similar bills later annexed to subsequent American constitutions, discussed the subject of "right," he knew where to find his predicate. "All acts of legislation apparently contrary to natural rights and justice are in our laws, and must be in the nature of things, considered as void," he argued in *Robin v. Hardaway* (1772, *Jefferson's Reports*, Vol. 1). Then he continued: "The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on Earth. A legislature must not obstruct our obedience to Him from whose punishments they cannot protect us. All human constitutions which contradict His (God's) laws we are in conscience bound to disobey. Such have been the adjudications of our courts."

He cited Coke's report of Calvins Case and Bonhams Case, which had stated the same principle in extended form. This was the basic principle of English Common Law justice that Parliament cast overboard in 1688 in favor of its own absolutism and applied to America in 1776. The Founding Fathers cast their lot with the principle and dared to repudiate Parliament. American law alone thus preserved the continuity of Coke's doctrine:

The law of nature was before any judicial or municipal law and is immutable. The law of nature is that which God at

the time of the creation of the nature of man infused into his heart for man's preservation and direction; and this is the eternal law, the moral law, called also the law of nature. And by this law, written with the finger of God in the heart of man, were the people of God a long time governed before the law was written by Moses, the first reporter or writer of law in the world. God and nature is one to all and therefore the law of God and nature is one to all. (*Calvins Case*, 7 *Coke's Reports* 13 (a) 77 Eng. 392.)

When we were in the thick of the argument with Parliament over this point, Blackstone was publishing this projection of the same doctrine in his *Commentaries*:

This law of nature being coeval with mankind and dictated by God Himself is, of course, superior in obligation to any other. It is binding all over the globe in all countries and at all times: no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all of their authority mediately or immediately from this origin. (Blackstone's *Commentaries*, Book 1, Introduction.)

The foregoing quotation laid an accommodating groundwork for the language of the Declaration of Independence. American law and government were thus joined upon the firm foundation of God's creative purpose. As late as 1892 (Church of the Holy Trinity vs. United States, 143 U.S. 457) the Supreme Court of the United States summed up the association of law and morals in America with a complete documentation of our history from Columbus to Kaskaskia

and from the Mayflower Compact through the Declaration of Independence to the constitution of the last state then admitted to the Union.

WALL OF SEPARATION

Very recently, the present Supreme Court of the United States has seen fit to discuss this same subject again, reaching the unprecedented conclusion that henceforth God and morality must be separated from the affairs of State by an impenetrable wall of separation. (People of Illinois Ex rel McCollum vs. Board of Education, 69 S. Ct. 461.) The Court neglected to tell us what disposition we are to make of all the religious documents described in *Church of The Holy Trinity v. United States* (supra). Inferentially, the decision stigmatizes the Declaration of Independence and the constitution of practically every State of the Union as trespassers upon its newly erected "Wall of Separation." Expressly, it dogmatizes the modern determination to secularize American Law and Government. It tells us categorically that what we have treated as a silk purse is in reality a sow's ear and henceforth must be so regarded.

What has happened in the administration of justice in America between 1892 and 1948? I venture to say simply that we have "lost the ball" and in losing the ball we are in grave danger of losing the game. If we rule God and morality out of our

constitutional system, the thing that remains will neither produce justice nor preserve freedom. It is possible to take the oxygen out of a glass of water but what remains will not quench your thirst, and in like manner a Godless system of American law and government will not quench man's age-old thirst for true liberty. When God goes out of any system of justice, a vacuum is created which sucks in a tyrant to take God's place. Without God there is no logical way in which to justify the existence of any inviolable personal right, and

when "rights" are thus indefensible, lawyers are at the same time outmoded.

It is very commendable to promote efficiency and economy in the administration of justice, but remember that the most exacting and punctilious service will not save a dinner where all plates and platters are empty. The last great banquet of law and justice on the face of the earth is now scheduled to become a mere Barmecide feast. It will take the intelligence and energy of able American lawyers to save it.



Beneath the Law

"One cannot, in fact, pretend to unify the private rights of peoples without first being convinced of the ineluctable existence and universal validity of these rights. On the other hand, how can one be convinced of their existence and universal value without the necessary light shed by human personality on these multiple relations of men, above all in the domain of goods and services?

"Only those who see in the individual a simple unit, one among many other equally anonymous units, a simple element of an amorphous mass, a conglomerate which is the opposite of society, can deceive themselves with the illusion of regulating these relations among men solely on the basis of public law, ignoring the fact that law itself ceases when the person, with all his attributes, is no longer considered as the beginning and the end of social life.

"These reflections are particularly relevant in regard of the right to property. This is the central point, the pivot round which, by force of circumstances, all your labors gravitate. Acceptance of this right holds firm or falls with recognition of the personal dignity of man, with recognition of the imprescriptible rights and duties inherent in the free personality, received from God."—*Pope Pius XII to the International Institute for the Unification of Private Rights, May 24, 1948.*

India's Modern Newman

ELMER VON FELDT

Reprinted from The FAR EAST

A CENTURY ago John Henry Cardinal Newman, recognizing Catholicism as historical Christianity, forsook Anglicanism, entered the Catholic Church and became an irresistible influence bringing thousands back to Rome.

Three-quarters of a century later a great religious leader in the Orient, likewise recognizing the Catholic Church as "the only true embodiment of historical Christianity," renounced his Jacobite schism and was received into the Church. He also has been the guiding influence in a movement which already has brought thousands back to the true fold.

This great prelate is Archbishop Mar (Lord) Ivanios of Trivandrum, India, who recently has been touring the United States to acquaint himself with the work of the Church here in Catholic Action and education. Attracting large crowds wherever he has gone, this colorful Archbishop was received at the White House by President Truman, with whom he discussed the history of Christianity in India.

Archbishop Ivanios made his submission to the Church in September, 1930, together with four other Jacob-

ite schismatics — his then auxiliary bishop, a priest, a deacon and a layman. Since then the reunion movement he initiated has brought back to Rome four schismatic bishops, about 125 priests, and more than 60,000 members of the laity.

The story of the Archbishop's conversion goes back to 1926 when five prelates of the Jacobite Church met in synod and decided that the Jacobite schism in India should end by return of the entire Jacobite population to obedience to the Pope.

As an initial step the prelates decided that the faction to which they belonged should first seek reunion with Rome. Mar Ivanios, then the Jacobite Metropolitan of Bethany, India, was deputed to open correspondence with Rome.

The Metropolitan wrote the Holy See in 1926 and received the final answer in August, 1930. It stated that the Holy See had decided that the prelates could be received into the Church, that the validity of their Baptism, Holy Orders and Consecration would be recognized and that they and their followers could retain the Syro-Malankara rite.

However, one of the Jacobite bish-

* St. Columbans, Nebraska, September, 1948

ops had died before Rome's answer was received, and two other bishops had by that time decided against entering into communion with Rome. So only Mar Ivanios and his suffragan, Mar Theophilus, chose to abandon the schism.

CONVERSION

In a simple ceremony, which however rocked the Jacobite Church, Mar Ivanios and his four companions made their submission to Rome on September 20, 1930. Their conversion was accepted by Bishop Louis M. Benziger of Quilon, India.

By papal decree, Mar Ivanios retained his dignity of Archbishop, was given free use of his powers of Sacred Orders and jurisdiction, and received the faculty of receiving his followers into the Church.

Shocked by the submission of their Metropolitan, widely recognized as one of India's outstanding religious leaders, thousands of priests and members of the laity in the 400,000-member Jacobite Church in Malabar, India, began to consider their schism seriously. Conversions came with lightning rapidity.

They occurred in all parts of the Jacobite Church, among high church dignitaries, intellectuals and lowly laborers, singly and in groups. "I have been able to win 1,000 souls within the past few weeks," the Archbishop himself said a short time later. Among his many converts were his

87-year-old father, his 82-year-old mother, and the high Jacobite churchman, Mar Severios.

Explaining his conversion to the world, Archbishop Ivanios stated that early in life he had special admiration for the saints. "I craved for the heavenly joy of communion with them," he related. "I found out that this joy was unattainable so long as I stayed away from that Church which had produced and nurtured them."

Another feature of the Church that struck him irresistibly, he continued, was "the fact of its sure guidance on everything connected with life, both for individuals and for mankind."

While the numerous conversions were heartening to Archbishop Ivanios, the difficulties and heartaches they entailed were sorely trying. As parish after parish joined the Catholic Church, the Jacobite authorities instituted law suits for retention of the parish properties, and the impoverished converts found themselves without places to worship or bury their dead.

"Many congregations would come into the Catholic Church, could we but provide them with straw huts to serve as churches," Mar Ivanios wrote to the Catholic Near East Welfare Association in the United States. "The building they now occupy would remain in Jacobite hands in the event of their conversion."

When Rome received Mar Ivanios

into the Church, it was well acquainted with his irreproachable background. Born in 1882 in Mavelikara, India, with the name Ivanios George Thomas Panikervirtis, he felt an early call to the priestly life. He was ordained a Jacobite priest and devoted himself to teaching in the high school at Kottoyam.

Later he taught at a college in Serampore. Many of his pupils from Kottoyam followed him and they opened a little house adjoining the college. Ivanios introduced a rule of religious life and acted as guardian. In the meantime all tested their vocation to the religious life. Later the group adopted a rule modeled on that of St. Basil, took vows and became the first religious community in the Jacobite Church of Malabar.

CONSECRATED BISHOP

Meanwhile, Mar Ivanios was consecrated the Jacobite Bishop of Bethany and a number of sisters and cousins of the new religious group requested the Bishop to found a similar community for women. Both communities were called the Imitation of Christ. Their entire membership joined the Catholic Church soon after their leader's submission. Both communities are flourishing today.

After being received into the

Church, Mar Ivanios was made the Ordinary of a new rite of Catholics, the Syro-Malankara rite. It traces its history back to St. Thomas, the Apostle, whom tradition holds as the Father of the Church of India.

Unfortunate attempts by European clergy and lay leaders in the 16th century to force Latin customs on the native Christians caused a schism, to which most of the St. Thomas Christians adhered. While the schism was healed in part a generation later, many of the South India Christians remained outside the fold and later placed themselves under the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch to be assured of apostolic succession. This is the group that Mar Ivanios is leading back.

While the reunion movement was considerably slowed down during the war because of a cessation of outside material aid, its spiritual fiber remains vigorous and progress is continuing steadily. Continued litigations among rival ecclesiastical jurisdictions in the Jacobite Church in India have weakened the allegiance of its members and many are looking seriously to the Catholic Church for salvation. However, the task before Archbishop Ivanios is great before his joy will be "complete" by the return of all Jacobite schismatics "to the true fold of Christ."

Catholic vs. Communist Doctrine on Dignity of Man

ALPHONSE H. CLEMENS, PH.D.

*Reprinted from The Catholic University of America BULLETIN**

WE ARE living in an era of great upheaval and of great interest. Beneath the external veneer of peace can be heard the volcanic rumblings of revolutionary ideas and practices. This is the type of age which Sorokin would label "transitional," a period of adjustment to newly emerging social forms and patterns and one characterized by chaos, ferment and not a little bewilderment. Historians like to distinguish between revolutions which are minor and those which are major. In the former, some one or other social form changes; in the latter, each and every social form—religion, family, the state—experience a profound and significant change. Such is an era in which an old philosophy is being liquidated and a new philosophy is being born.

Society presently finds itself astride such a major social revolution. We stand today the bewildered heirs of the tragic social calamities born of the wild philosophies of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. These social heresies lie today unmasked in the exploitation and chaos of the so-called "modern era." We hasten to

liquidate these obnoxious social principles, and in so doing find an emergency social system of another variety take on shape and form. With assurance we know that the recurrent cry of the current system for "free enterprise" and "free operation of supply and demand" are merely the death-rattle of a decadent social system. At the same time with little assurance we are launching out into a new social era, the outlines of which are extremely dim, confused and indeterminable. It would seem that the demands of the times require more than anything else that we first of all drop the anchor, take our bearings, and orient our social course.

The task is not a little simplified by the fact that only three possible social systems confront us for investigation and selection. Several years ago Msgr. Fulton Sheen rather pointedly cautioned that if we are to build the social structure anew, we will first have to decide, with clarity and precision, for whom it is to be built. For the type of social structure will depend upon our answer to the query "for whom are we building?" Were

* Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C., May, 1948

one to build a home, he would have to know whether it is being built for a family of children or a childless family. In the former instance, a nursery and bedrooms (perhaps a play room) would be included; in the latter, of course, such would be omitted.

HISTORY AND THEOLOGY

The herculean task of reconstructing the social order must, likewise, be resolved in determining the nature and dignity of man for whom society is meant. Both history and theology offer three—but only three—answers to our question; and historic experience holds forth only three types of society corresponding to the theories of man's nature and dignity. From the revolutionary haunts of French Romanticism emerges the answer of Jean Jacques Rousseau (whom Napoleon indicted as being more responsible for the French Revolution than any other) assuring us that man is a perfect creature and should as such be allowed to carve out his individualistic destiny free from social entanglements. "Rousseau describes the natural status as an idyllic Paradise in which the individual, as an autonomous, free, fully self-sufficient being, lived a perfect life of perfect goodness."¹ Upon this premise, which refuses to admit man's social personality, modern civilization has reared

the anarchical social structure of Liberalism, Individualism and Capitalism which we are liquidating today.

Quite the opposite was Hobbes theory of the nature of a man. Not unlike Epicurus of Greek fame, he held that man was intrinsically evil, a lawless creature given only to unreasoning quest of selfish personal interests.² Machiavelli, likewise, warns the ruler to act on the assumption that all men are malicious and evil and must needs be ruled by the iron fist.³ Calvin, in more theological fashion, saw man as the utterly depraved creature who fell from a state of perfection, at the time of his fall in the Garden of Eden, to a state of complete debasement and degradation. Upon the basis of this concept, which denies the dignity of man's individual personality, is predicated the "Blue Law" state of Puritanism, the "Leviathan" of Hobbes, the unscrupulous tyranny of Machiavellian dictatorship, the collectivist state of modern totalitarianism. For just as it is thought proper to place individually depraved men in straight-jackets, so it is held proper to regiment the entire mass of the people in a "collectivist straight-jacket" because of their intrinsic and complete depravity.

It remains for the Catholic position to posit man as neither, on the one hand, perfect nor, on the other, depraved; but rather, as a somewhat

¹ Rommen H., *The State in Catholic Thought* (Herder, 1945), p. 60.

² *Elementa Philosophica de Cive*; see foreword.

³ *Discorsi I*, 3.

imperfect creature, deprived of the full perfection enjoyed before the fall. As such, man retains still his essential dignity as a human being. Since he is not perfect, his actions must be circumscribed by moderate regulation; but since he is not depraved, his dignity resents the shackles of the regimented collectivist social system.

In evaluating the three theories of man and of society, we must remain mindful of the fact that, in the long run, all doctrines of human rights and of political liberty derive from the concept of man's nature as having special worth that distinguishes him from other creatures. But "There may be error in the reading of human nature. Most of men's efforts to read human nature, and frame a system of life in accord with it, err by inability to seize the whole. One part of human nature is isolated, the rest ignored."⁴

This is precisely the error of both Individualism and of Collectivism throughout the ages; and this is precisely the error of collectivist Communism today. "Giving in untechnical language a purely personal opinion, I venture to suggest that in the realm of human thought and action the most devastating and at once the most prevalent mistake is man's penchant for monism—that error which tries to reduce all things to one category of being."⁵ Here is an error

which denies the bilateral nature of man—his twofold nature—both personal and social, and posits a unilateral concept of man, either as a being exclusively individualistic or a being entirely and completely collectivistic. Man is smashed into indignity either by the process of being "atomized" into social anarchy or by being "homogenized" into a collectivist mass.

Historically this singular monism can be traced from the pantheism of the ancient Rigneda, the Brahmins and Upanishads; through the Ionians of ancient Greece, the Pythagoreans, the Eleatics, the teachings of Heraclitus, and even Plato. This error, first arrested by Aristotle and more thoroughly dissected by Thomas Aquinas, received a renaissance in the pantheistic immanence of Luther and Zwingli, the simplicities of Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes, Berkeley, Fichte and Hegel, from whom both Karl Marx and Hitler drew their inadequate concepts of man's nature and erected upon it a superstructure of collectivism. "Everywhere and always, I say, this devastating monism has been the chief and most dangerous enemy of truth. Everywhere and always it has corrupted the idea of man; it has corrupted the idea of God; it has corrupted the proper relations of man to man and man to God. Everywhere and always, on the contrary, Catholic teaching has held to a sane

⁴ Sheed, F. J., *A Map of Life* (New York, 1944), pp. 14-15.

⁵ Tobin, T. J., "The Family and Parish Worship" (*National Liturgical Week*, 1946), p. 16.

dualistic conception of man; he is a creature of soul and body, of time and eternity; he is an individual microcosm, but he must live in society; he has inalienable personal rights, but he has inescapable social duties.”⁶

CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY

In the Catholic philosophy of life, man's position is a paradoxical one, though quite the opposite of his status under Communism. If man is a miserable sinner by virtue of his defections, he is also the proud possessor of a new dignity and worth by virtue of a saving grace. If man is an outcast from the garden of Eden, an exile from a state of natural happiness, he is also a “son of God,”⁷ an “heir to heaven,”⁸ a “temple of the Holy Ghost,”⁹ and a “partaker of the Divine Nature.”¹⁰

Contrasting the dignity of man under Christianity with that of ancient paganism, Chesterton comments: “In one way man was to be haughtier than he had ever been before; in another way he was to be humbler than he had ever been before. . . . We were to hear no more the wail of Ecclesiastes that humanity had no preeminence over the brute, or the awful cry of Homer that man was only the saddest of all the beasts of the field. Man was a statue of God walking about in the garden. . . . The Greek

had spoken of men creeping on the earth, as if clinging to it. Now man was to tread on the earth as if to subdue it. Christianity thus held a thought of the dignity of man that could only be expressed in crowns rayed like the sun and fans of peacock plumage.”¹¹

The struggle today, as in the early days of Christianity, is a struggle over man. Whereas then Catholicism had to enter the lists against Greek and Roman monism, today the lines must be formed against the modern revival of ancient monism under the guise of materialistic Communism. For, “If man possess not a spiritual and immortal soul, if he is merely the highest form of animal, compact of flesh, blood and nerves; if he is merely more highly organized matter, then he has no more dignity, sacredness, intrinsic worth than a cow or an ape. He has no more rights than a cow or an ape. He has no personality to be violated. He may properly be used as a mere instrument to the aims of the stronger and more cunning individuals, or to the purposes of the State. Only the sanctity of personality can logically oppose the pretensions of the totalitarian State, or withstand its tyrannies in the name of law and reason. If there be no such thing as personal dignity, no man has a moral right to develop his personality or to live on

⁶ Tobit, T. J.; *op. cit.* p. 17.

⁷ St. Paul: *Rom.* VIII, 14.

⁸ Matt: XXV, 31; IV, 23; VIII, 12.

⁹ St. Paul: 1 Cor. VI, 19.

¹⁰ 2 Peter IV, I.

¹¹ Chesterton, G. K., *Orthodoxy*; Ch. VI.

a higher plane than that of the animals."¹²

Referring to the materialistic monism of today, Chief Justice Vinson of the U. S. Supreme Court declared in a recent address: "Under this view, man is a mere automaton incapable of sharing in the determination of his own destiny, bereft of dignity, capable of responding only to the grosser of materialistic motivations and irrational passions. That such a creature is incapable of exercising the high privilege of self-government is obvious. Essentially this conception of the nature of man underlies all of the totalitarian doctrines of our day, and unfortunately, it underlies the thinking of some in our own midst who shrink from its inevitable and logical conclusion. . . . This conception contains the seeds of destruction. We must resist it and prove it fallacious."¹³

Perhaps the wide breach between the dignity of man as posited by Catholicism and the indignities to which man is subjected under Communism can no better be summarized than in a comparative analysis of the two positions given us by Msgr. Fulton Sheen:

a) For the Christian: man is free, because his initiative comes from *within*, namely, from his soul. He may be likened to a captain of a ship who is free to chart his own course and choose his own port.

b) For the Christian: man is a *subject*.

A subject can determine his actions, as the artist can freely paint whatever picture he chooses.

c) For the Christian: there are two kinds of unity, economic-political unity, and organic-spiritual unity by which we are members of one another in the Mystical Body of Christ.

d) For the Christian: man is a citizen of two worlds, and in virtue of the second, he possesses certain inalienable rights, such as life, liberty, and property, of which no State can deprive him.

e) For the Christian: man exists not only in the present, but in the future. Personality is independent of time, because it has its intrinsic worth at all times.

f) For the Christian: man must determine the nature of society and be its master.

a) For the Communist: man is not free, because his initiative comes from *without*, i.e., from the Party, which dictates not only what he shall do, but also what he shall *think*. He is like the rudder of a ship which goes wherever it is directed by the captain, who is the dictator of the Party.

b) For the Communist: man is an *object*. An object cannot act, but is acted upon as a social automaton, and becomes like the chisel in the hand of a sculptor.

c) For the Communist: there is only one kind of unity—the economic-political unity which is achieved not from the inside by spiritual ties, but from the outside by force, terror, and propaganda.

d) For the Communist: man is a citizen of only one world, and since the State is all, it follows that man has no rights except those which the State has given him. Therefore the State, when it chooses, can take those rights away.

¹² Ryan, J. A., "The Dignity of Personality," in *Democracy Shall It Survive*, (Wash., D. C., 1948), p. 17.

¹³ Baltimore Review, Oct. 3, 1947.

e) For the Communist: personality is related to time. Man is alienated from his humanity in the *present*, to attain a dubious humanity in an earthly paradise in the *future*. As Lenin puts it: "During the period of dictatorship in which there would be no freedom, people would become accustomed to the new conditions

and would feel free in a Communistic society." (*The State and Revolution*).

f) For the Communist: man is determined by society, completely absorbed and possessed by it, and loses his identity in it as a drop of water loses its identity in a glass of wine. Instead of being the master of society, he is its slave.¹³

¹³ "Communism: The Opium of the People" (*The Franciscan*, Feb. 1937), pp. 10-11.



Myopic Mr. Wallace

"It is the foreign policy that counts. As a reporter of three conventions, including the Progressive, I was a witness to the way in which the Communist leadership successfully fought even the mild statement that the Progressive party did not give 'blanket endorsement to the foreign policy of any power.' Under the circumstances, the convention was giving blanket endorsement to the foreign policy of the aggressive Soviet dictatorship, the cruel masters of some ten million slaves, the men primarily responsible for the present cold war, the ruthless seekers after universal power.

"The amazing thing is that Henry Wallace should have persuaded himself and many of his followers that he, propagandist of World War II, ardent supporter of Yalta, Potsdam and the Morgenthau Plan, apologist for all Stalin's crimes, including the displacement of more millions than Hitler had time to displace, preacher of abject appeasement, should be hailed as an apostle of peace. At best his program would sacrifice decency in Europe, not to true peace, but to a mere postponement of atomic war.

"I am well aware that some perhaps even in this audience will resent my criticism of the Soviet Union as the mightiest tyranny that has yet cursed this earth, not a fulfillment, but a betrayal of socialism. The significant fact is that neither Henry Wallace himself nor any of his followers will debate me on this or any other issue, or will deny any of the facts about slavery and economic inequality in Russia, upon which facts I have been compelled sorrowfully to reach my present judgment."

—Norman Thomas, Socialist candidate for President, in a speech at Buffalo, N. Y., Sept. 19, 1948.

THE EDITORIAL MIND

The 'Right to Work'

YOU find all sorts of people talking about the "right to work" these days. Newspaper publishers are doing it. The National Association of Manufacturers is doing it. And Cecil B. De Mille—he of silver-screen and air-wave fame—is doing it.

Now, these people have their own idea of what the "right to work" means. But it's only fair to warn them that they should be careful in using this phrase, because it may backfire something awful.

The idea of the "right to work" may catch on with the great masses of our people, and then you can't tell what might happen. We ourselves can visualize some startling occurrences from all this drum-beating about the right to work.

We can foresee a breadline in the next depression, for example. Instead of accepting unemployment as unavoidable, these men may remember something about the "right to work." Can you see them walking into the NAM office and pulling out some of the NAM's own literature?

Or how about the millions of Ne-

groes deprived of jobs they are qualified to handle? What if they should take all this "right-to-work" talk seriously? Or how about the hundreds of men beyond forty or fifty unable to get a job, because they're past their prime and aren't a "good investment" for industry?

Surely, if the DeMille & Co.'s right-to-work campaign meant anything at all, it would try to guarantee this important right to the millions for whom it is now a farce. But here's the tip-off.

DeMille and his cohorts aren't primarily interested in protecting Negroes from employment discrimination. They aren't interested in safeguarding the jobs of millions during depressions.

Nope, this proposed right is of a strange breed. Its admitted purpose is to protect, not workers, but strike-breakers and scabs. Under a "right-to-work" law a union could be handcuffed in its efforts for higher wages, better hours and decent working conditions.

And yet, like we were saying, maybe this "right-to-work" talk may bring some unexpected results. Joe Worker may not have a college de-

gree, but he can usually spot a pile of hokum, even when it's dished out by Big Names.

So maybe he'll really understand this right to work. Instinctively he may know that it's the right to a decent job by which he can support himself and his family. And perhaps he'll know that this right is certainly not protected by hamstringing unions, since the chief purpose of unions is to safeguard the worker's rights.—*WORK, Chicago, Ill., July, 1948.*

No Air for Atheists

THE issues involved in the debate over time on the radio for atheists are of the most basic kind. As brought out in the hearings before a Congressional committee investigating the policy of the Federal Communications Commission, the crux of the matter is whether or not the existence of God is a "controversial" question.

In its famous "memorandum opinion and order" handed down on July 19, 1946, the Federal Communications Commission observed that God is "variously thought of" and argued in effect that the broadcasting of atheism should be permitted as a government policy.

There is no need to repeat here all the arguments so ably brought forward against this extraordinary position by Father Edmund Walsh, S.J. of Georgetown University. But the

underlying principle may be helpfully re-emphasized.

Freedom and rights are things which can be understood and enjoyed only within a very definite framework. Every human right is ultimately derived from some fixed and indubitable principle. Generally speaking we enjoy in a democracy the right to argue and disagree with our fellow citizens and elected representatives, only because we have begun by agreeing on certain primary truths.

In any system of truths and rights everything can't be relative and a matter of opinion. There must be an absolute to serve as a starting point. There must be an unchallenged basis upon which the edifice of a democracy is erected. You can claim and exercise the right to express your opinion about most things simply because there are a few things which are not a matter of opinion.

The philosophy of American democracy rests on the principle that there exists a Creator who has endowed all men with certain unalienable rights. From these primary rights all other rights are derived, and to protect these God-given rights governments are formed.

A government can protect these rights only by protecting and insisting on the first truth from which they are derived. Obviously if the existence of God is a "controversial" question and a mere matter of opinion, then all rights supposedly guar-

anted by our democracy are controversial and a matter of opinion.

For these reasons we believe that our government is failing in its first duty—that of preserving itself—if it permits publicly licensed and controlled radio facilities to be used for the propagation of atheism.—*THE RECORD, Louisville, Ky., Sept. 11, 1948.*

Restrictive Covenants

THE decision of the United States Supreme Court in three cases arising in Missouri, Michigan and the District of Columbia, holding that covenants to bar Negroes from owning real estate cannot be enforced in the state or Federal courts, is an important victory in the long fight to outlaw discrimination in housing. In these cases the lower courts had granted judicial enforcement of these agreements. Although the Court did not question the validity of restrictive covenants as voluntary agreements, it denied the authority of the courts to grant judicial enforcement. This decision concluded a thirty-year legal battle against the pattern of residential segregation in the United States.

The opinions were handed down by Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, who wrote: "We hold that in granting judicial enforcement of the restrictive agreements in these cases, the States have denied petitioners the equal pro-

tection of the laws and that, therefore, the action of the State courts cannot stand. We have noted that freedom from discrimination by the States in the employment of property rights was among the basic objectives sought to be effectuated by the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment. That such discrimination has occurred in these cases is clear. Because of the races or color of these petitioners they have been denied rights of ownership or occupancy enjoyed as a matter of course by other citizens of different race or color."

In the District of Columbia case, Judge Vinson held: "It is not consistent with the public policy of the United States, to permit Federal courts in the nation's capital to exercise general equitable powers to compel action denied the State courts where such State action has been held violative of the guaranty of the equal protection of the laws."

Once more the Supreme Court leads the way back to the observance of fundamental American principles.—*INTERRACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y., May, 1948.*

Catholics and Miracles

RECENTLY in the press there were references to Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham. He has denied, among other things, the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, and he states that science has disproved mira-

cles. This is no surprise. Bishop Barnes has shown himself a materialist for many years.

We shall discuss only one of his objections or heresies here. He states that "belief in miracles has gone from the scientific world." First, we might challenge the truth of the statement. Many great scientists today are Catholics and believing Christians. They know that miracles have little or nothing to do with science. Their belief in miracles is part of their belief in the Omnipotence of God. They know that the laws of nature which they observe can be held up or speeded up by the Lord of Nature. They know that fire still burns even though three children were not fried in Nabuchodonosor's furnace. It is because they have observed these laws of nature so accurately that they are impressed by genuine miracles.

But, quite apart from the truth of that wide generalization about belief in miracles having gone from the scientific world, let us examine the position of true science and genuine miracles. Is there any essential clash at all? A miracle, by definition, is an event that involves a change in the general order of things. More accurately, we define it as a fact, which the senses can vouch for, that is be-

yond the natural power of every created agency and which manifests an immediate and extraordinary intervention of Divine Omnipotence. Properly understood, this definition shows that miracles are not in the province of science at all. Every scientific device is used by the Catholic Church to check up on miracles. But it is only when no created agency can account for the happening or the suddenness of the extraordinary event—it is only then, sometimes after years of research and the examining of evidence and eye-witnesses, that the Church declares that an event is miraculous. That is the scientific way of going about the proving of miracles. But all that science can do is to state that in a certain age, at a certain given time, an event has occurred which is beyond the power of unaided nature. Nervous diseases, conditions that might be remedied by auto-suggestion, unknown disorders—all these are ruled out before the Church pronounces on a miracle.

The Church believes in miracles because it believes in the all-embracing Power of God. Anyone who does not so believe doubts God's power and cannot in the full sense be called a Christian at all.—*THE SUNDAY EXAMINER, Hong Kong, China, Oct. 26, 1947.*

Labor Day Statement, 1948

Issued by the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference

ON NOVEMBER 14, 1947 the Bishops of the United States in their celebrated "Statement on Secularism" summarized the Christian view of economic life as follows:

The Christian view of economic life supports the demand for organization of management, labor, agriculture and professions under government encouragement but not control, in joint effort to avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good.

Economic life, then, is to be organized. This is the first of the principles of Christian social ethics. But the second principle, as stated by the American Bishops, is even more important. Economic life is to be organized for a purpose, namely, "in joint effort to avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good."

In other years the Social Action Department of NCWC, in its annual Labor Day Statement, has emphasized both of these principles but has concentrated for the most part on their application to the American labor movement—its rights and its needs, its duties and its opportunities and its function in the reconstruction of the social order. This emphasis, we are convinced, was wholesome, for it cannot be repeated too often or too

emphatically that the Church founded by Christ—Himself a workingman—champions the right of labor to organize; indeed, it looks upon the widespread organization of workers as an absolutely necessary prerequisite to the establishment of industrial peace and economic justice. This year, in keeping with the spirit of the occasion, our emphasis in this Labor Day Statement again is on the problems of organized labor and the principles governing it.

At the same time, however, we deem it appropriate to broaden the scope of our Labor Day Statement and to direct a special appeal to employers as well as to workers and to employers' associations as well as to unions. We appeal to both groups to become more conscious than ever before of the primary purpose of their respective organizations—"to avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good"—, and we urge them to cooperate unselfishly among themselves and with the government to hasten the reestablishment of a better and a more Christian social order.

In the first place, therefore, we again encourage the labor movement to organize the unorganized workers

of the United States. On the occasion of its national holiday, we congratulate the labor movement on its accomplishments and ask our Divine Lord to protect it and to bless its activities during the coming year.

SELF-CRITICISM AND REFORM

The American labor movement has its faults and imperfections, of course, but there is reason to believe that its members and its leaders, for the most part, are themselves even more conscious of these defects than are its unfriendly critics. There is reason to believe, too, that these defects, e.g., Communist infiltration, are being remedied from within the movement itself more rapidly and more effectively than they could be remedied by punitive legislation. In general, it would be fair to say that there is at least as much, if not more, of the spirit of self-criticism and self-reform within the labor movement as there is within parallel organizations of employers and professional people.

Accordingly, we repudiate as ill-advised and discriminatory the efforts of those who, not content with the disruptive effects of the Taft-Hartley Act, are clamoring for further restrictions on the labor movement. We call attention in particular to the baneful influence of certain types of punitive legislation at the State level which are calculated to foster rather than diminish industrial strife and which are designed, whether wilfully

or not, to cripple the labor movement rather than reform it. In addition we recommend that the Taft-Hartley Act itself be reconsidered by the Congress of the United States, and that the cumbersome and obstructive provisions concerning the labor movement itself be eliminated. At the same time its socially beneficial features should be retained.

A year ago today we expressed the judgment that the Taft-Hartley Act "is an inadequate and shortsighted approach to the very complicated problem of industrial relations." The chronicle of its day-by-day enforcement during the past year indicates that the measure was not sufficiently constructive and reinforces our conviction that the Congress ought to dig deeper in its inquiry into the underlying causes of industrial unrest. This time it ought to frame such legislation as will promote cooperation rather than give occasion for needless conflict.

At the same time we call upon the rank-and-file members of the labor movement to take a more active interest in a day-to-day affairs of their unions. The American labor movement is a tremendous force for good in the economic and social life of the nation. If it is to continue to be such and if it is to live up to the added responsibilities which its very numbers impose upon it, its members, every last one of them, must voluntarily assume their full measure

of responsibility for the soundness of its directives and programs. Regular attendance at union meetings is the very minimum to be expected of every worker who holds a union card. Catholic trade unionists are reminded, moreover, of their further obligation to become instructed in the principles of Christian social ethics and, in co-operation with other men of good will, to work in and through their respective unions for the Christian reconstruction of the social order.

American employers and management representatives are called upon in turn to take the same intelligent interest in the affairs of their own organizations and trade associations that workers are expected to take in the affairs of their unions. Catholic employers and management representatives are reminded that they too, even as Catholic workers, are obliged to ground themselves in the principles of Christian social teaching and to make every effort to apply these principles to the social order in and through their respective organizations.

We rejoice in the fact that employers are banded together in such great numbers in their own appropriate organizations. Such organizations are as indispensable in their own way as the unions are to the reconstruction of the social order. The time has come, however, to insist more emphatically upon the obligation of employers and union members

alike to see to it that their respective organizations carry out their proper function in the economic order. At the present time employers' associations and unions, for whatever reasons, are preoccupied too much with the protection of their own interests and too little with their obligation "to promote cooperation for the common good."

It is not our purpose at present to apportion the blame for this unfortunate state of affairs. The record indicates, however, that segments of the organized labor movement, which at long last are coming into their own after having had to struggle desperately for their very right of existence, have repeatedly invited American industry to discuss with them the establishment of an Industry-Council system. Unfortunately their overtures in this direction have been ignored and in some instances openly rebuffed or caricatured irresponsibly as socialistic or worse.

Be that as it may, we earnestly call upon labor and management to let bygones be bygones and to work together more generously than ever before "in joint effort to avoid social conflict and to promote cooperation for the common good." "In default of this free cooperation," the Bishops remind us in their statement on secularism, "public authority is finally invoked to maintain a measure of economic order, but it frequently exceeds the just limits of its power to

direct economic activity to the common good."

In summary, therefore, we are recommending again, as in our Labor Day Statement of 1946 and 1947, the establishment of an Industry-Council system, with added emphasis this year on the responsibility of labor and management alike to work toward this end within their own unions and trade associations. The underlying philosophy of such a system and the arguments in favor of its being established as rapidly as possible have been stated as follows by Our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII:

The time has come to repudiate empty phrases and to attempt to organize the forces of the people on a new basis; to raise them above the distinction between employers and . . . workers, and to realize that higher unity which is a bond between all those who cooperate in production, formed by their solidarity in the duty of working together for the common good and filling together the needs of the community. If this solidarity is extended to all branches of production, if it becomes the foundation for a better economic system, it will lead the working classes to obtain honestly their share of responsibility in the direction of the national economy. Thus, thanks to such harmonious coordination and cooperation, thanks to this closer unity of labor with the other elements of economic life, the worker will receive, as a result of his activity, a secure remuneration, sufficient to meet his needs and those of his family, with spiritual satisfaction and a powerful incentive towards self-improvement. . . .

This "closer unity of labor with

the other elements of economic life" cannot and should not be imposed from the top by the government. Nevertheless, the government is charged with the responsibility of encouraging organized labor and organized management, as well as the other organized groups in economic society, to move as rapidly as possible in the direction of an Industry-Council system. "First and foremost," says Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *On Reconstructing the Social Order*, "the State and every good citizen ought to look to and strive toward this end: that conflict between the hostile classes be abolished and harmonious cooperation of the Industries and Professions be encouraged and promoted. The social policy of the State, therefore, must devote itself to the reestablishment of the Industries and Professions. In actual fact, human society now, for the reason that it is founded on classes with divergent aims and hence opposed to one another and therefore inclined to enmity and strife, continues to be in a violent condition and is unstable and uncertain."

GENERAL ECONOMIC WELFARE

We therefore recommend that the government, in fulfillment of its duty to encourage class cooperation and promote the general welfare, call together the responsible leaders of labor, management, agriculture and the professions and encourage them to plan

together, with government assistance and in full view of public representatives, for the common good of their respective industries or professions and for the general economic welfare of the nation as a whole. The details of such a system obviously cannot be outlined in advance. They will have to be worked out patiently and cooperatively by the parties directly involved in the economic process, and one industry will naturally differ from another in many respects. It cannot be denied that the task will be a very difficult one. But where there is a will, there is a way. At the present time in the United States, apparently it is the will that is lacking. We are still, to too great an extent, a nation of individualists unable or unwilling to understand in all its fulness and in all its implications what the American Bishops had in mind when they said in their November Statement that "economic enterprise is a . . . social function in which owner, manager, and workman cooperate for the common good."

But "the time has come to repudiate empty phrases," including the empty phrases of individualism on the one hand and those of collectivism on the other. "Surely it ought to be plain today," the American Bishops tell us very pointedly, "that there is no remedy for our economic evils in a return either to nineteenth century individualism or to experiments in Marxism." We are called upon

to establish a new system of "economic collaboration in the spirit of genuine democracy."

We must add that there are certain economic and social abuses which cannot wait upon the full-blown reconstruction of the social order for their solution. They call for immediate action upon the part of the Federal Government. We refer particularly to the desperate need for Federal housing legislation, including a generous provision for the erection of low-cost public housing; for a substantial upward revision of the statutory minimum wage; and for an improvement in the benefits and an extension in the coverage of social security. These and other types of social legislation, at the Federal and State levels, are so urgently needed for the protection of the basic living standards of American families that both political parties, even during an election year, ought to be working together harmoniously for their speedy enactment. We cannot play politics with the economic and social welfare of the great majority of our people without breeding a spirit of cynicism and despair for which as a nation we shall have to pay a fearful price.

In conclusion, we call again for a renewal of the Christian spirit, without which we shall be laboring in vain as we try to reconstruct the social order, for "unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that

keepeth it." Cooperation between labor and management for the general economic welfare is more than a matter of new techniques in the art of industrial relations. It calls for a deepening in all of us of the virtue of Christian charity. "Indeed," says Pope Pius XI in concluding his encyclical *On Reconstructing the Social Order*, "all the institutions for the establishment of peace and the promotion of mutual help among men, however perfect these may seem, have the principal foundation of their stability in the mutual bond of minds

and hearts whereby the members are united with one another. If this bond is lacking, the best of regulations come to naught, as we have learned by too frequent experience."

Through Christ, and with Christ, and in Christ may all of us, therefore, dedicate ourselves again this Labor Day to the establishment of a new social order which will be worthy of men and women who, in the unspeakable goodness of God, are called to share in His own divine life and to share in it more abundantly.



Christ and Labor

The great social principles which emerge from the Gospels are liberty, equality and fraternity in God and the dignity and rights of labor in Christ. They were radical and revolutionary then; they are commonplaces today. And they are the fundamental principles of the Labor movement. Unfortunately, the Labor world of our time has been saturated with the propaganda of the extreme Left. One would think that these ideas had their origin in the French Revolution or the Communist Manifesto. The truth that has been forgotten or suppressed is that Christ, and Christ alone, first taught these principles to a startled and incredulous world, and Christianity down the centuries spread them through the world. The man who stands for liberty, equality and fraternity, and the rights and dignity of labor, but rejects Christ and Christian practice, is unconsciously living on Christian capital inherited from the past.—*The SOUTHERN CROSS, Adelaide, South Australia, Nov. 2, 1945.*

Has Obscenity a "Right to Freedom"?

BY THE EDITOR

*Reprinted from The ADVOCATE**

FROM time to time we have heartening instances of the survival of moral sanity and common-sense in the minds of the plain people of this country, despite the continuous assault on these virtues from a certain powerful section of our "intelligentsia."

There was one good example of this recently, in the result of a Gallup Poll held on the subject of banning obscene books. Interest in this matter has been revived by the sentence which was recently inflicted upon the author Robert Close, for his part in the writing and publication of a filthy novel entitled *Love Me, Sailor*. In the wake of an agitation on this account raised in the usual quarters, the question has been "put to the nation" by a scientific method of inquiry, which has been found to produce singularly accurate results as a gauge of public opinion. The result shows that three-fifths of Australians are in favour of banning this sort of foulness, although 56 per cent recognize that the unfitness of a book for children and adolescents is not, in itself, a ground for prohibition.

No doubt many of our "superior minds" will see in this result simply

a demonstration of cultural backwardness. For ourselves, while we have no illusions about the level of our popular culture, we hold very strongly that a cultivated taste and knowledge of literature is by no means essential to the formation of a sound judgment in this matter, which is not one of aesthetic taste, but of the moral effect of a work on members of the general public to whom it is offered. It is mere confused thinking to maintain that because a policeman or a farmer is not well acquainted with Shakespeare or Chaucer or Swift, he is therefore incapable of distinguishing between the adult treatment of human living and the production of corrupting offal.

A number of those who profess to stand for the principle of "freedom of thought and expression" find it outrageous that the law of the land should be invoked in the name of public morality, to impose penalties upon an "artist" for the productions of his brain and pen. The whole culture of Australia is hampered—as they hold—by the crude outlook which treats the published foulness of a well-known writer as though it were an offence of the same sort as

any other public indecency. The ordinary citizen who commits the offence of obscenity can be—and occasionally is—dealt with by the police with general approval: but it seems that the case is changed when the person concerned is one of the sacred caste of "intelligentsia." The rule which is good enough for plain folks is not to be applied to these superior beings—just as the loyalties which bind the common citizen are not to be held valid in the case of those other mandarins of our time, the "scientists." A Nunn-May betrays his country's secrets to a potential enemy, and is held justified on the ground of his "scientific" conscience: a Close writes a farrago of unmentionable obscenities, and is defended on the ground that this sort of thing is "artistic realism" and objectivity in the description of life.

MORAL ANARCHISM

These "modern minds" who challenge every sanctity, and deny all spiritual dignity to man, have one great cause, it seems, which they will defend with passionate zeal—namely, the thing they call "intellectual freedom"; that is, their own holy privilege of moral anarchism and social irresponsibility. To hear them, one would think that the future of democracy and the humanities depended upon the continued enjoyment of immunity of those who use their art to corrupt and destroy the values upon

which all sane and healthy civilized life must rest. It is high time that this so-called "freedom" was exposed for the pernicious sham it is. The expression of men's thought and imagination in works of art cannot be divorced from its social consequences, where these works are widely disseminated; and the public authority is bound to take serious cognizance of these effects. The need of this would be easily enough understood if we were menaced, for instance, with a considerable propaganda of race-hatred which produced outrages against the Jews. There would be little question of the desirability of stopping the inflammatory publications as well as the offences incited by them. The propaganda of sexual corruption is obviously no less dangerous than the propaganda of hate, though the effects may be less spectacular. It is vitally enervating and personally degrading to those whose minds it affects: it tends to brutalize and barbarize, and to invite to a disorderly perversion of those instincts upon whose right use the preservation of the race depends. The maintenance of a high standard of human decency is essential, therefore, to civilized life and liberty. This does not involve a foolish prudery which makes the adult treatment of certain human problems and situations impossible: but it does involve intolerance towards the "artistic" expression of mere filth or perversion where no

end is served except that of prurienty. The false doctrines of artistic irresponsibility and anarchism have played a sinister part in modern thought which greatly resembles that of "laissez faire" in the economic life of modern communities. Just as the myth of "freedom of contract" was used to cover monstrous abuses of exploitation, so the myth of "intellectual freedom" has been used to shield men whose social influence has been deadly to our civilization—the destroyers of moral values, the purveyors of perversion, the doctrinaires of anti-human tyranny. It is high time that democracy realized the need of protecting itself on this fundamental level, as well as on that of social economics. Indifferentism in the sphere of values—especially where the protection of the youth is concerned—has already brought it very far along the road to destruction. What is needed is not that the existing laws

should be repealed or weakened, but that the machinery for dealing with cases such as Close's should be rendered more efficient, by operating so as to prevent the publication of works of the kind condemned. An intelligent system of supervision of printed works would have prevented such a disgusting production from ever reaching the public at all. As it is, large numbers have been already sold in Australia, and are now fetching high prices secretly, and being lent round: while the unsold stock can, and, no doubt, will, be disposed of abroad, to spread its foul infection in other lands. It is pleasing, however, to hear that at least one of the moral anarchists of the "intelligentsia" has felt the rude hand of the police on his privileged shoulder, just as if he were a mere ordinary nasty fellow. Let us hope that his experience may serve as a deterrent to "artistry" of the same type.



Commercial Tactics

"It is significant that the Communists have never gained power in any country by majority vote of the people, not even in Russia. They work through labor movements and political parties, appearing to sponsor the workers' cause and thus winning a minority vote and capturing a few key offices in unions and government. Moscow then installs smart manipulators in these offices who extend their control by bribery, obstruction, reprisals, deceit and terrorism. Once control is gained, interest in workers' welfare is completely subordinated to Moscow's effort for world control."—LABOR'S MONTHLY SURVEY (AFL), November-December, 1947, p. 3.

Dutch Bishops on Christian Unity

Pastoral letter read in all the churches of Holland simultaneously with the opening of the meeting of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam, Aug. 26, 1948

MANY non-Catholic Christians are uneasy with regard to religious dissensions among Christians. They believe that dissension is in contradiction with the Lord's mandate and is certain to have fatal consequences for the well-being of mankind.

From this uneasiness sprang the ecumenical movement, which seeks a new religious unity of all who acknowledge Christ as God and Saviour. This movement took shape shortly before the recent World War, as a result of the foundation of the World Council of Churches, and the Amsterdam Congress will be the first plenary meeting.

There is no participation, dear brethren, by the Catholic Church, though the Church, more than anyone else, deplores the religious dissensions of Christians and realizes the fatal consequences.

The Church is ready to admit that this striving after a new religious unity is animated by the good purpose of many. Nevertheless she feels it necessary to remain aloof from participation in the Amsterdam Congress. This aloofness is not based on a fear of losing prestige or on any other tactical consideration; the atti-

tude arises solely from the Church's realization that she must remain unflinchingly loyal to the task Christ imposed upon her.

The Church is one, holy, catholic and apostolic, founded by Christ that the work of salvation should be continued by her until the end of the world. The Church is Christ's mystical Body and Bride. Undecaying, this unity exists in her, for Christ promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against her.

Therefore, the one way to bring the dissension of Christians to an end is to return to the Church and to the unity always kept safe in her.

Suppose the Church were to participate in endeavors to create a new religious unity and on a footing of equality at that. It would be an admission that the unity ordered by Christ is not to be found in her and that the Church is not His true Church. The Church can never admit that, for is not Christ's only holy Church one Mystical Body and one Bride?

The Church, by its very aloofness, goes on teaching that the unity willed by Christ has been preserved in her and that in her this unity remains accessible to all.

Besides, a real unity requires a unity of faith. This is seen more clearly now by many of the ecumenical movement. In this unity of faith, guaranteed by Christ, He has commissioned Peter and the other Apostles and their successors to preach the Gospel in His name and with His authority: "He that heareth you, heareth Me." He has promised them the assistance of the Holy Ghost. By the power of the Holy Ghost have the Popes and Bishops, as successors of Peter and the other Apostles, kept inviolate the revealed truth and preached it with unfailing authority.

They will do this until the Lord returns. Whoever accepts their word accepts the word of Christ and thus enters into a unity of faith. How could the Pope and Bishops discuss together with others whether they have misunderstood the word of God's revelation and have announced human inventions as Divine truth?

Such a procedure would amount to a disbelief in the promise of Christ or doubt in the power of the Holy Ghost. No, they must go on preaching the doctrine of Christ with unfailing authority and so keep the unity of faith.

Hence there is no question of participation. We will, however, follow the Congress with the greatest interest. It issues from a great and honest desire for the unity willed by Christ; many want to accept Him as God and Saviour. We should not remain in-

different to the fact that this Congress may mean a step forward or a step backward: a step forward, if the nostalgia for the Mother Church and the unity bestowed on Her becomes stronger; a step backward, if many should feel satisfied with a unity which would be far away from the unity established by Christ. Return to the Mother Church is the only way, dear brethren, through which real unity may be reached.

FERVENT PRAYER

However, we know there are deep-rooted prejudices which handicap this return. We know that owing to the anomalies at the beginning of the separation, increased by time and isolation, the distance between both has become such that the separated understand neither the voice nor the language of the Church. We know that return has become impossible for many without internal strife and great sacrifice. We know that a loyal conversion is never possible when God does not by His grace illuminate the human mind and move the human will. And we know as well that God wants to be asked for that grace.

Hence the Bishops' call on all priests and faithful for fervent prayer: for all the participants at the Congress, for all non-Catholic Christians who look for unity, who love Christ in deed and truth and who, though separated from the Church, look up unconsciously to the Church

as the haven of salvation. Pray for all those who are leaders of non-Catholic Christian communities and who have such great responsibilities, because ordinary faithful are dependent on their guidance and are often unable by themselves to come to the true version of things.

However, you should not forget that just as your prayer so also is your own example required. In days gone by, it has been partly the lack of Christian life that has been the cause of defections from the Mother Church. Through a salutary reformation "in head and members" at the Council of Trent, the Church has herself stopped the defections. Hence the return to the Mother Church can be best furthered through the holiness of our Faith, made visible through holiness of our lives and our works.

If ever in the past in the fight for Catholic unity Catholics have not always been mindful of charity, and hence have forgotten at times the Apostle's word: "doing truth in Charity," (Eph. 4, 15) if ever, therefore, Catholics have shared the guilt of estranging our non-Catholic brethren from us, let us remember that this was certainly not the spirit of our Mother the Church.

For the Church herself is and remains the Holy Church. She remains holy in her worship, her Sacraments, her Holy Sacrifice and in her life of grace that she achieves through these

means. She remains holy in her doctrine, which comes from God and which leads to God and the salvation of souls. She remains holy, for at all times she produces great Saints. In this holiness does the Church ever show forth her divine origin. But her members are and remain men; in them it is possible that the human side of things (*cf. Mit Brennender Sorge*¹) appears at times even to excess. And these human failures can easily become a source of scandal and be the reason why many do not perceive the real holiness of the Church.

Hence, we Catholics carry with us in our days a heavy responsibility. Now that in many followers of Christ a strong desire has been born for greater unity, it is incumbent on us that we fill ourselves anew with the spirit of Christ and that, in all things and in all our actions, we seek only Christ and the extension of His Kingdom.

More than ever have we to mind Christ's command: "May your light shine among men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father Who is in Heaven" (Matt. 5, 16). More than ever must we radiate in our lives the holiness of the Church. May God help all to understand this duty and "may the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Christ, help our weakness" (Rom. 8, 26). Finally, dear brethren, we ask you that in all

¹ CATHOLIC MIND, May 8, 1937.

churches and chapels of the Catholic Church of Holland, on Sunday, August 29, a Solemn or at least a "Missa Cantata" be celebrated to ask from God the grace that all may share in the unity of the Church. For this

mass is appointed the "Missa ad tolendum schisma," a Mass to undo the schism in Christendom. We trust that all Catholics will unite themselves as fervently as possible with this appointed Holy Sacrifice.



Recreation on the Farm

"The challenge before rural leaders, and especially rural pastors, is to equip young men and women in rural communities to cope with the problems affecting recreation. The rural parish offers just the organization to meet this problem. It is the job of the pastor and rural teachers so to educate youth that they will regain the old spirit of community and parish cooperation and participation. The parish center may have to compete with the roadhouse and near-by city social life by offering attractive and far more wholesome entertainment. There will have to be societies and clubs of various kinds to meet the needs of young people of various age levels and aptitudes. A well-planned program for the entire year will have to be formulated by ingenious leaders to stimulate youth. It will have the salutary effect of keeping them interested in their surroundings and contented with rural life; it could be educational, cultural and uplifting.

"If any one agency can restore the true spirit of Christian recreation, it is the Church, which, in years gone by, knew so well how to entertain her children through religious festivities, song and folk dancing. Today the Church is faced with the problem of restoring that same spirit to a generation of rural young people who have been betrayed by recreational 'hirelings'."—*Rev. Joseph V. Urbain in The SHIELD, April, 1948.*

Relations With Non-Catholics

MAURICE BEVENOT

*A paper read at the Third Annual Summer School of the Newman Association,
at Stonyhurst College, 1947. Reprinted from the MONTH**

WHEREVER there is a feeling that Catholics should avoid too close contacts with non-Catholics it is due, perhaps, to the idea that their faith would be endangered. In support of this view one might appeal to the fact that all heretics are treated by the Church as being at least technically "excommunicated." The word implies being *cut off from intercourse with one's fellows* and it is too ordinarily presupposed that this is done primarily to *protect the faithful* from contamination. Such a conception of excommunication, however, is quite a false one, and one or two historical texts will make this clear.

If we go to St. Thomas and notice how he deals with the question: "May Catholics consort with non-Catholics or not?" we find that, though he refers to the danger which may be involved, he does not connect this with excommunication. He gives it as his opinion that it all depends on circumstances; but that in general those who are *strong in the faith*, and who are more likely to convert the non-Catholics than be themselves perverted, should *not* be forbidden relations with pagans or Jews; on

the contrary, there may be urgent need for such relations; but *simple folk*, whose faith is weak, might lose it altogether if they mixed with them; *they must be forbidden such intercourse, at least any great familiarity or unnecessary contacts.*

St. Thomas here speaks only of pagans and Jews. That is because he has already dealt with heretics and apostates, not from the point of view of their being a *danger* to the faithful, but from that of their being *excommunicated*. For, as he says, the Church's excommunication is a *punishment* which is inflicted on heretics and apostates; and *this* is the reason why the faithful are forbidden all relations with them. Pagans and Jews do not come under the spiritual authority of the Church; they are not liable to punishment from her, and so are not liable to excommunication. (*Summa Theologica* IIa IIae, q. 10 a. 9)

Thus from St. Thomas we learn, first, that relations with pagans and Jews are only forbidden to those who are weak in the faith, but not to those "who are strong in the faith and more likely to convert them than be them-

* 114 Mount Street, London W. 1., June, 1948

selves perverted"; not forbidden, then, to members of the Newman Association or of other organizations for Catholic Action. And he would no doubt have said the same of relations with heretics and apostates, but for the fact that they were undergoing the punishment of excommunication, a punishment which required the cooperation of the whole body of the faithful.

MEANING OF EXCOMMUNICATION

Nowadays we have perhaps lost the sense of what excommunication was intended for, and even in St. Thomas' day this sense was fading out. In the early ages (as we see, for instance, in the Rule of St. Benedict) it was exactly parallel to being "sent to Coventry" in old school-boy style; its whole purpose was to make a delinquent feel ashamed of himself, by being cut off from his fellows and studiously avoided by them. Being thus forced upon himself and made to feel his isolation, the excommunicated might be expected to examine his conscience and to be brought to his senses by the sheer humiliation of his position. The purpose of excommunication was to induce *rubor* (or *pudor*), blushing, shame-facedness, and thus repentance. This very "human" idea of excommunication gradually disappeared, in practice, until the penalty came to mean, chiefly, being deprived of the Sacraments and of other spiritual or temporal bene-

fits. St. Thomas did indeed retain something of the old idea, for replying to the objection that schismatics ought surely to be *brought back* to the Church, not *cut off* by excommunication, he writes:

Excommunication is not meant to prevent others from having such apostolic intercourse with schismatics as may lead them back to the unity of the Church; in any case the cutting off itself in a sense "brings them back" since, often enough, feeling the shame of being cut off, they are brought back to repentance (*Dum de sua separatione confusi, quandoque ad poenitentiam reducuntur*) (*Summa Theologica*, IIa, IIae, q. 39 a. 4 ad 2m).

This delightful paradox brings out well the original character of excommunication; but it is obvious that it will only work where "sending to Coventry" is effective, just as it would not work where the greater part of the school would have to be sent to Coventry. So, too, it will not work where the bulk of the population is heretical. The recognition of this may or may not be found somewhere in St. Thomas, but a happy chance has led to its discovery in an old manuscript dating back to the century preceding that of St. Thomas. It includes an anecdote from the life of St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany, a country where he had, at times, to deal with Christians whose Christianity was at a very low ebb indeed. That was in the middle of the eighth century.

Our unknown author is treating of the prohibition of relations with

heretics. After saying that St. Paul allowed the faithful to take their meals with *Jews* or *pagans*, provided it gave no scandal to the weaker brethren, the writer goes on to say:

But if one of the brethren has been excommunicated we must keep away from him and not join him at prayer or at meals, or even salute him, so that he may at least be shamed into amendment (*ut saltem pudore resipiscat*). However, where a whole multitude of those who ought to be our brethren are wrong-headed, and no doubt deserve chastisement, we are not obliged to avoid them; for they should now be treated like the pagans, and can be consorted with on the same basis as they are, viz., with a view to their conversion. Otherwise, when so many are avoided at once, they are not so likely to be converted, since their numbers will be proof against their feeling shame (*quos multitudo defendit a pudore*).

Thus, we read, Boniface acted, who had been sent by the Pope into the Teutonic countries, and who finding all kinds of misconduct there nevertheless lived with people who were married to their own blood-relations. This led to his being accused to the Pope for consorting with those who had been excommunicated by the Roman Church, whereas he had made a solemn oath always to uphold the decrees of the Roman See, and in particular the decree forbidding all intercourse with such people as being excommunicated. It was in fact Boniface who had excommunicated them himself! Yet Boniface received from the Pope nothing but praise, and this on the ground that he had decided to treat them as if they were pagans, and was seeking their amendment rather by sympathy than severity; nor was he considered by the Pope to have broken his oath.

If we sum up what is pertinent to our subject from those older times, we have two permanent principles. 1) Those who are sufficiently firm in the faith should have free intercourse with non-Catholics, with the hope of leading them to the faith or of bringing them back to it. From this point of view our modern "heretics," because of their numbers, can be equiparated to those who are not Christian at all. The only qualification is that such intercourse should not be a cause of scandal to the weaker brethren, i.e., make them think that one religion is as good as another, or that what one Catholic can do another can. For, 2) those who are not firm in the faith, and are likely to lose it if they mix with non-Catholics, should avoid all unnecessary contacts.

While these principles stand, there are two chief factors which differentiate the situation today from that in the past. The first is that the old legislation envisaged formal heretics, people who should have known better and who knew perfectly well where they could be put right about the faith. Today it is recognized that most non-Catholic Christians are, more or less, in good faith; that technically they are merely "material" heretics, and from one cause and another are not aware that they are astray, or if they are aware of it think they see plenty of reason for trying any road rather than that leading to the Catholic Church.

The second factor is that formerly the social structure was relatively stable and was built on principles deriving from or baptized by the Church itself, the ordinary Catholic accepting them as a part of the nature of things. Today, on the contrary, we are in a period of transition; the very expression "social security" is a symptom of the *absence* of security and stability. Besides that, many of our institutions, which have for centuries contributed to the order and stability of the country, yet stand indifferent if not moderately hostile to the Church. This greater complication of the life of the country, and the state of flux in which we are today, make it all the more evident that a passive attitude to the present state of things, such as characterized the average citizen in old Catholic days, would now be out of place. Nor is it active resistance that is now required of us, but rather an attitude of real *cooperation* (in the etymological meaning of the term), readiness to take a share in creating the order which is to follow the present period of transition. Where Catholics have the chance—and very many have—they need to play their part in the national life at every level and in every department of it; to contribute to the formation of public opinion, which even now has not altogether lost its power. But all this means contacts and relationships with non-Catholics such as were never practised

or even envisaged in the past.

In another context one would apologize for these platitudes, since they form the background of the work undertaken by most of our active Catholic societies. But we are considering now our relations with non-Catholics, not merely as *non-Catholics*, but insofar as they *have* some religious adherence, or at least some religious ideas. And it is well to remember that *all* the religious bodies in this country are minorities today, no less than we ourselves. Even the Church of England is becoming acutely conscious of this fact; and that Church is itself divided into many minority groups. But they and all the other denominations (and of course believing Jews, too) feel that the country as a whole is becoming more and more paganized, and that forces are at work which threaten their own effective existence. That being the case, we may perhaps make a sort of examination of conscience on the subject, such as the Catholics of France have boldly done more than once since the war.

COOPERATION TO WHAT EXTENT?

In the first place, are we to look upon their having any religious views at all as a help, or as a hindrance? For instance, we have been working with someone for weeks; we have got friendly and come to like each other; one day he drops some remark which shows us that he is, let us say, a

practising Anglo-Catholic. What is our reaction? If from individuals we pass to bodies, we can ask ourselves whether we are to work with them as Catholics cooperating, specifically, with Anglicans or Methodists or Congregationalists, Quakers or Jews; or are we to cooperate with them only as citizens with other citizens. In other words, is the fact that the religious beliefs of these people are erroneous or inadequate to weigh more with us than the fact that they have some religious beliefs?

Next there is the question of our aims. Is our aim merely to improve the position of the Church in the land, or is it to aid the country as a whole? We may take the school question as an example. Of course the needs of our Catholic schools must be kept in the forefront; but is our aim merely to get better terms for our schools, or is it to improve education generally? Do we point with satisfaction to the number of Church of England schools which have been given up to the Local Education Authority—whereas the number of our schools has been constantly growing in spite of our disabilities? Again, what do we think of the *agreed syllabuses* of religious instruction in the National Schools? Are they going to be good or bad for the next generation? Or better than nothing? It is a delicate point; but can we disinterest ourselves from it? Perhaps we can hardly expect others

to take an intelligent interest in our own concerns if we show none in theirs.

Having opened the ground a little with these queries let us return to the question of cooperation in practice. A review of the last few years seems to reveal, roughly, two schools of thought. The first may be called that of "Integral Catholicism" which will have nothing to do with any such cooperation. "There must be no half-measures, no watering down; experience in cooperation proves that you will always be let down in the end." The other school would stretch cooperation to the limit: "Let us go as far as we can provided no vital Catholic principle is sacrificed." These last find their justification in the Papal appeals to all those who believe in God, to all men of goodwill, to work together to resist militant atheism and to save the world from hatred and injustice.

But in certain spheres the first school is undoubtedly right. For instance, in the work of the Young Catholic Workers it is generally the only practical line to take. The Young Workers need something clear, simple, concrete; they are brought into direct touch with Our Lord in the Gospels; they study, judge and act on the clear, definite teaching of the Church about Christ, the Mass and the Sacraments, and they rely on prayer for the good works which they undertake, such as

bringing back lapsed Catholics, entering into the active life of their unions with sound ideas, showing up communist propaganda. Now it seems clear that all this would be impossible if Catholics and non-Catholics were mixed together. The Catholic chaplain or the senior leader might sometimes be able to address them all together, and they would all be the better for it; but he could not speak of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament as he would to his Catholic boys alone, nor rouse them to that loyalty to Jesus Christ which finds its center in Communion and in the tabernacle. Besides, the other chaplains too would naturally want to address them all together; they might give them much valuable information and many useful tips, but our lads would not be helped much by the general woolliness of the spiritual motives which they would be likely to suggest.

A CATHOLIC LANGUAGE

Here then is an instance where co-operation would prevent the greater good, but this attitude may have its drawbacks in other spheres. It is a commonplace that as Catholics we have a language all our own by which to express the truths of our religion. That language is based on our traditional philosophy, and on the application of that philosophy to the Faith. Our words have a definite meaning in any particular religious context; we have in them an excellent

medium for accuracy and precision of expression. But these same words, or many of them, have in course of time, outside Catholic circles, been debased in meaning; they have taken on a vague or ambiguous sense, or have even come to have an opposite meaning. The result is that non-Catholics either understand nothing of what we say, or think they understand us when in fact they have mistaken our meaning altogether.

The situation creates a dilemma. Either we fail to convey our meaning because the expressions which we use are foreign to our modern hearers; or else we use language which they do understand—but then can we be accurate in expressing our faith to them? It has been said by one of our leading theologians that nothing can be done until we have brought the country back to sound philosophy and to the real meaning of words. If that is the view of the Integral School, it would stand self-condemned. Not only is it fantastic to expect the non-Catholic world to shed its philosophies and come and sit humbly at the feet of St. Thomas; but even if that were feasible, is our direct apostolic action to close down until this re-education is completed? St. Paul gave his new disciples only the milk of the Gospel, because he realized that they were unable as yet to be fed on meat; Our Lord Himself distinguished clearly between the parables which He gave to the multitudes, and the more inti-

mate explanations of the mysteries which He gave to the Apostles. And even to these He said that He had much more to tell them, but that "they could not bear it now."

In this matter we should be careful not to interpret Papal ordinances issued in circumstances often very different from those of the present time as if they had been issued yesterday. Such utterances must be understood in the sense which they bore at the time when they were made. If Gregory XVI said that "liberty of conscience" was sheer insanity (*deliramentum* was the word he used), we must remember that at the time the claim to "liberty of conscience" meant a claim not to be bound by any law either of God or man. The phrase has come to mean something quite different, so that to repeat today what the Pope said a hundred years ago would be to convey a false idea of the mind of the Church.

So much for the "integralist" school; in certain respects it is undoubtedly sound, in others it may at times be out of touch with realities. We turn to the school of "cooperation to the limit." We remember the famous joint letter to the *Times*, signed by Cardinal Hinsley, Archbishops Lang and Temple and the Moderator of the Free Churches. We remember the response which it evoked, the creation of the *Sword of the Spirit*, and the hammering out of the principles of cooperation with

Religion and Life. There was much enthusiasm. Joint Christian Councils were set up in many cities and towns, but after a time failures were registered in more than one place. It is to these that the critics of cooperation point.

Now what were the causes of these failures? Sometimes it was a well-meaning chairman (perhaps the mayor of the town) who would open the proceedings with congratulations that the churches had, at long last, agreed to sink their differences and to work together in Christian charity! Sometimes there were imprudences on the Catholic side. More often, there was opposition to the Catholic standpoint by one or two intransigents on a committee; so that agreement became possible only on some quite jejune and inadequate statement. Catholics often felt that they had been let down by those who should have stood by them; and the question was asked: "Does not the Church lose in prestige, and what is more important, in moral influence, if Catholics put their names to something, not indeed wrong in itself, but which does not represent the full Catholic teaching nor really meet the situation?"

Another alleged result of such co-operation was that some of our weaker brethren in the faith tended to think that "it doesn't seem to be so important after all, whether one is a Catholic or not." If this were at all common, it would be serious; at the

same time one cannot resist asking whether such "injured innocence" is always so innocent as is made to appear. A third result of full cooperation has been that Catholics who practise it are liable to be challenged by the Integral School for speaking, and especially for writing, in a less than Catholic sense. This means that the integralists will not make any allowance for one who, in addressing a mainly non-Catholic audience, fails to use those complete formulae of the Catholic faith which, in the circumstances, would be unhelpful to those whom he wants to help.

THE POPES AND COOPERATION

To sum up: Cooperation has its limits; it presents difficulties; in certain spheres it must be excluded. Always, and for all Catholics, the first and most important need is to know our faith ourselves and to practice it fully; with our heads, with our hearts, with our hands, in all our private life, in all our dealings with others. If we notice that non-Catholics are often so much better than their beliefs, that may remind us that we are so often *less* than what our faith should lead us to be. If we fail to convince others, it is because we are not Catholics to our fingertips. So for ourselves our great need is to intensify our prayer, our union with God, our personal devotion to Our Lord, our charity and forbearance toward others.

But the truth of all that does not exclude cooperation with non-Catholics. Rather it calls for it. The last twenty years have seen both Pius XI and Pius XII appealing again and again for united action with all those who worship Our Lord, with all those who believe in God, even with all those of good will, to resist the atheistic, anti-human evils of the day. The allocutions of the present Holy Father are all too little known. Their number is amazing, and he has given guidance (often in considerable detail) on every feature of the modern situation: on international, national and social problems of every kind. These Papal utterances show clearly on what lines Catholics can and should cooperate with others. We may therefore lay down as something which stands beyond question that cooperation with non-Catholics is a thing which we should aim at, something we should take every good opportunity to realize.

What, then, of the difficulties in practice, the setbacks which we have experienced, the checks which we have met with from different sources? These are all to be expected, and even apparent failure can contain real success. Why should we be surprised if, when we do work for Christ, we find that we have to take up our cross daily? At the same time work for Christ must be *intelligent* work, appreciative of realities: such as the reality of non-Catholic mentalities, of

non-Catholic convictions, of non-Catholic lack of convictions. In our personal contacts with those not of the Faith we should seize upon what is true in their religious beliefs, and seek to lead them further, rather than put them on the defensive by direct attack. People come to the Church by that which is good and true in what they already hold, and rarely by being shown conclusively where they are wrong.

The need to go about cooperation intelligently is the greater that what the Popes have been urging upon us is, as it were, an unchartered sea. Situations arise, are bound to arise, which have no precedent. Only our faith, our common sense and our prayer can guide us. There are bound to be mistakes; we must be prepared to learn from experience, that of ourselves and that of others. Let us acknowledge our mistakes and find new ways of fulfilling the Popes' directions.¹

¹ Further official guidance in cooperation with Non-Catholics has been provided by a declaration from the Holy Office dated June 5, 1948. It is there stated, among other points, that neither priests nor laymen may attend inter-denominational meetings dealing with questions of faith without a dispensation from the Holy See. A speaker on the Vatican radio has stated that religious discourses in small or intimate circles would not be affected by the decree.—Ed.



Right of Association

"In her philosophy of social justice, the Church vindicates for both labor and management the right of organization, in order to achieve by combined effort and power those legitimate objectives which individuals by themselves are unable to attain. These organizations, whether of laborers in industry and agriculture, or of employers and management, must be guided by a due respect for justice and a sincere desire to collaborate with each other: this implies mutual consideration of needs as well as rights, of obligations as well as benefits and the faithful observance by all parties of agreements and contracts freely made. Much bitterness and hardship, strife and dissension, material losses and spiritual distress can be avoided, if principles, policies and practices between these different groups are worked out on the basis of mutual understanding and consideration, rather than on the basis of distrust, suspicion, warlike strategy and the desire for power and domination."—*From Labor Day message of the Most Rev. Joseph Francis Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans, Sept. 2, 1946.*

Massachusetts FEPC Succeeds

MILDRED H. MAHONEY

Chairman, Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission

*Reprinted from the INTERRACIAL REVIEW**

NEVER underestimate the value of a job. It may mean the difference between security and insecurity. It may mean the difference between recognition and the feeling that one is just a cipher. It may mean a sense of accomplishment or it may mean dull routine. It is one of the most important elements in any person's life. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, recognizing what the chance to work in a manner commensurate with one's ability means to any man or woman, passed the Fair Employment Practice Act on May 23, 1946. Its first paragraph states:

The right to work without discrimination because of race, color, religious creed, national origin or ancestry is hereby declared to be a right and privilege of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth.

The passage of this law was prefaced by considerable study. In 1940 the Massachusetts Commission on the Employment Problems of Negroes studied the employment policies of 558 concerns; and in 1944 another special commission made a survey of discrimination against persons in employment because of race, color, religion or nationality. Besides these

two official groups many private organizations also produced evidence that revealed considerable economic discrimination. And so the Fair Employment Practice Law was enacted.

THE LAW-ENFORCING FUNCTION

Under the Massachusetts law the powers of enforcement rest with a State Commission made up of three members appointed by the Governor and serving for three years. The present Commission is composed of Mrs. Mildred H. Mahoney, Chairman, Commissioner A. K. Cohen and Commissioner Elwood S. McKenney. In addition to the Commissioners, the staff includes an Executive Secretary, Leonard V. Avery, a part-time publicity director, four field representatives and four clerks. The Commission has the power to receive, investigate and pass on complaints involving discrimination in employment and to hold hearings and subpoena witnesses. It also has broad powers to initiate surveys and programs tending to eliminate discrimination and promote good will. The Commission desires not only full compliance with the law, but willing-

* 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y., August, 1948

ness to comply, and so in the handling of cases, the cooperation of all concerned is earnestly desired. With this in mind the Commission is not out to pillory anyone, but makes full use of the terms of the Act which specify that the first step in settling any case must be through "conference, conciliation and persuasion." In handling the 391 cases brought to us up to date, no stronger method has been necessary.

NUMBER OF CASES AND THEIR DISPOSITION

Pending	35
Dismissal because of lack of jurisdiction	13
Withdrawn	9
Dismissal for lack of probable cause	70
Closed after investigation and conference	264
Total	391

Concerning these last two groups our Rules of Practice and Procedure state:

If the Investigating Commissioner, after investigation, is of the opinion that the respondent has not engaged and is not engaging in any unlawful employment practice, he may order the complaint dismissed *for lack of probable cause*.

If, after investigation and conference, the Investigating Commissioner is satisfied that any unlawful employment practice of the respondent will be eliminated, he may, with the consent of the complainant, treat the complaint as conciliated.

By far the largest number of complaints coming before the Commission has alleged discrimination based on color or race. The total number of cases divides about equally between men and women.

In addition to these cases the Commission has made 50 investigations of instances of discrimination not related to economic opportunities. We have no jurisdiction in these instances and cannot go beyond investigating the circumstances and publishing our findings if we so wish.

The statute authorizes the Fair Employment Practice Commission to establish Councils throughout Massachusetts.

The Commission may empower them to study the problems of discrimination in order to foster through community effort . . . good will, cooperation and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the Commonwealth . . . and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies . . . and for programs of formal and informal education which the Commission may recommend to the appropriate state agency.

THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION

Our State Advisory Council, with John J. Desmond, Jr., Commissioner of Education, Chairman, has recently initiated a study of what the public-school authorities are doing by way of developing democratic attitudes and behaviors. The findings of this study as tabulated reveal an encour-

aging increase of interest on the part of Massachusetts educators in one of democracy's most pressing problems.

Two local councils have been organized. The first in Springfield, with Mr. Roger L. Putnam, Chairman of the Board, Package Machinery Company, acting as Chairman, has sponsored a study of employment in twenty-four industrial concerns in that neighborhood. The Greater Boston Council, with Mr. Harold D. Hodgkinson, Vice-President and General Manager of William Filene's Sons Company, acting as Chairman, is conducting a similar study of thirty concerns in the Greater Boston neighborhood.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

A study has also been made of the labor organizations in Massachusetts. It is not all-inclusive, but sixty-five locals were selected as a fair cross section of the labor unions in the state. This survey had two goals. First, to determine the extent of integration of minority groups in the labor movement and second, to encourage this integration. Although most of the organizations professed a non-discriminatory policy, there were instances of a vicious circle caused by the inability of minority groups to gain the necessary training and experience to qualify for membership. The Commission was gratified to note the increasing number of labor unions that now prohibit in their constitu-

tion and by-laws any restricting of membership based on race, color or creed.

In addition to these studies the Commissioners have welcomed opportunities to explain the philosophy and provisions of the Act. Over 206 addresses have been made and over 125 conferences have been held with widely varying groups in the offices of the Commission. A quarterly newsletter "Toward Racial and Religious Understanding" is published containing contributions from forty-nine organizations, in the main private organizations. Increasingly this newsletter is becoming a record of the various efforts to promote inter-group understanding, respect and good will. We have not put out many educational materials, but our Summary of the Act has been widely distributed as has also the explanatory pamphlet entitled "What is the Fair Employment Practice Law?" The Associated Industries of Massachusetts has helped greatly in the distribution of these materials. The "Scrapbook for Teachers," which contains book reviews and summaries of noteworthy magazine articles, has been popular with the general public as well as with the teachers for whom it was especially compiled. And for a more specialized group who want to know just exactly how the Commission ticks we have our "Policies" and "Rules of Practice and Procedure."

In conclusion, then, may I empha-

size again that our Commission has acted under a two-fold mandate: 1) enforcing the law, and 2) carrying on an educational program. As indicated, the two are closely interrelated. We believe that they are both necessary—that an educational program alone could not have accelerated fair employment practice to any such degree as has been possible with the help of the Massachusetts law. Legislation plus education is the effective procedure. So realizing, the Commission applauds the judgment shown in the enactment of a law that specifies both. This same wisdom appears in the stipulation that the initial effort in the settling of any case must be attempted through the process of conference, conciliation and persuasion, which by its very nature invites cooperation and avoids compulsion. It works, as is proved by the fact that no case has gone beyond this stage of conference, conciliation, and persuasion, to the next step—a hearing.

We also know that our law-enforcing program, as well as our educational program, has vastly benefited by educational work that preceded the Commission. Governmental groups and private organizations have worked hard to promote good will and have succeeded to a very considerable degree. Their success smoothed our path considerably, and their continued

cooperation has been a splendid help.

It is our earnest hope that there will come a time when no cases at all will come to our Commission; and we will have reason to believe that discrimination has ceased to be in Massachusetts. In the meantime we are working hard to help bring about this happy state of enlightened self-interest. I say enlightened self-interest because we all benefit by aiding each individual to make his greatest contribution to the common good. Any person whose buying power is limited and who cannot hold a job commensurate with his ability is not being utilized to his capacity. He is experiencing, too, frustrations that may result in anti-social attitudes and behaviors. Apart from the above considerations, it must be emphasized that each case settled after investigation and conference may open up opportunities to scores of people who previously were not considered for employment. Our 391 cases put us in contact with industries employing many thousands of employees, and we have every reason to believe that these concerns are now employing solely on the basis of ability to do the job well. Also, the power of example is tremendous. Each concern that sets a good example makes it easier for the next to comply fully with our law.

On Economic Planning

Reprinted from *The Catholic Labor Observer**

CHRISTIAN Democracy, while repudiating a "planned economy" as an end in itself, is willing to use it as needed for building an economic democracy.

Disagreement arises among Christian Democrats regarding the means to be adopted for achieving an economic democracy. For Dr. Duhau of Argentina any means demanding active government intervention in economic life is forbidden; to him, "collectivism, Statism, interventionism are three synonymous words, all of them steps along the same road towards totalitarianism." Although European Christian Democrats generally do not condemn government intervention so absolutely, they share a certain distrust of it. The program of the Italian Christian Democrats, for example, declares in this respect that "The intervention of the State must not be understood as an end in itself."

Unlike the Argentine writer, however, the European Christian Democrats are willing to admit State planning. The Italian statement goes on to say that it is "a means of promoting the common good and harmonizing social forces by stimulating and co-ordinating the efforts of free initiative."

The Italian economist and Chris-

tian Democratic Minister of Labor, A. Fanfani, has pointed out that the question is not whether the economy shall be directed but rather who shall do the directing. "Even in the so-called free regime," he writes in his fine booklet on planned economy, "economic life actually develops according to the fragments of plans imposed on various occasions by the great industries and large banks, i.e., by those interests that have succeeded in prevailing" (*Economia Orientata*, p. 10).

Economic planning, in other words, "whether declared or not, has always existed and cannot be done away with." It is Fanfani's contention that there are situations in which it is neither possible nor just to rely on haphazard planning, but in which it is necessary to exert social control through government direction.

"The legitimately constituted authority . . . has the duty to intervene, to coordinate, integrate, and sustain the efforts of individuals in economic matters when necessary to obtain the full development of the human person and the common good."

In the present condition of war-torn Europe, the Christian Democratic parties have supported a large degree of direct Government inter-

vention in economic life. The task of reconstruction is so great as to need the coordinated efforts of the whole nation, and even that is insufficient, as is evident from the need for international aid.

This is generally recognized even by the strongest exponents of "free enterprise." The Marshall Plan in itself is the most extensive international intervention of government in economic life that has ever been organized in peace-time. But although "rendered indispensable by the circumstances, a planned economy," according to the MRP program, "must make possible the return to economic freedom and be conciliated with a maximum of private initiative and personal responsibility."

Christian Democracy, by founding its economic policy on the principle of subsidiarity, retains a flexibility which prevents it from being identi-

fied completely with either free enterprise or a planned economy.

Christian Democracy thus appears in the somewhat paradoxical position of supporting both freedom and planning in the economic order. Yet there is at bottom no contradiction.

The principle upon which it is based is summed up in the program of the Belgian Christian Social Party as follows: "Where private initiative is sufficient, the role of the State must be limited to that of aiding and co-ordinating, not absorbing; but against abuses by economic and financial groups, it must obtain respect for the common good and its own authority."

On this principle, it would be left to the initiative of individuals and private groups to achieve every economic end of which they are capable, subject only to the ordinary laws of the land.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: John LaFarge

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

CIRCULATION MANAGER: Edward F. Clark

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.